DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 355 152 SO 022 980

AUTHOR VanSledright, Bruce A.

TITLE Stories of the American Revolution Period: Comparisons of Two Fifth-Grade Teachers' Curriculum Mediation Practices. Elementary Subjects Center Series No. 67.

INSTITUTION Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects, East Lansing, MI.

SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.

PUB DATE Nov 92

CONTRACT G0087C0226

NOTE 117p.; For other titles in this series, see SO 022 981-987.

AVAILABLE FROM Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects, Institute for Research on Teaching, 252 Erickson Hall, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824-1034 ($9).

PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; Comparative Analysis; Curriculum Research; Elementary School Teachers; *Grade 5; Intermediate Grades; Outcomes of Education; *Revolutionary War (United States); *Social Studies; Student Attitudes; Student Development; Teaching Models; *United States History; Units of Study

ABSTRACT

Authors who have reviewed the literature on teaching and learning in U.S. history and in social studies have argued that a need exists for comparative case studies of teachers' history and social studies teaching practices and the influence that these practices have on students, especially at the elementary school level. This report, which is based on case studies of how two fifth grade teachers taught their students about the U.S. Revolutionary period, summarizes the teachers' teaching practices and compares them, noting how one teacher taught about the period as important in its own right, for its value in acquiring and appreciation of the past, while the other teacher taught about the period as an effort to help her students learn about the importance of historical knowledge as a tool in solving problems and making decisions. The report also outlines how these different teaching practices influenced what students learned and how they described their experiences with the unit. The report concludes by arguing that the teacher who encouraged students to think about the U.S. Revolutionary period as knowledge to be used as a problem-solving tool offered a richer set of learning opportunities than the other teacher. A list of 58 references is included and 5 appendixes provide the following materials: (1) the structured teacher interview protocol used for the study; (2) a sample K-W-L form for students asking three questions: (What do I know now about the American Revolution? What do I want to know? What have I learned?); (3) a pre-unit student interview protocol; (4) a post-unit student interview protocol; and (5) five tables giving a comparative analysis of the completed K-W-L forms and the two student interview protocols. (Author/LBG)

IRT
price
$9.00

ED 285 163

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Elementary Subjects Center
Series No. 67

STORIES OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION PERIOD: COMPARISONS OF TWO FIFTH-GRADE TEACHERS' CURRICULUM MEDIATION PRACTICES

Bruce A. VanSledright

Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects

Institute for Research on Teaching
College of Education
Michigan State University

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SO 022 980

MSU is an affirmative action/equal opportunity institution

Elementary Subjects Center
Series No. 67

STORIES OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION PERIOD: COMPARISONS OF TWO FIFTH-GRADE TEACHERS' CURRICULUM MEDIATION PRACTICES

Bruce A. VanSledright

Published by

The Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects
Institute for Research on Teaching
252 Erickson Hall
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48824-1034

November 1992

This work is sponsored in part by the Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects, Institute for Research on Teaching, Michigan State University. The Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects is funded primarily by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position, policy, or endorsement of the Office or Department (Cooperative Agreement No. G0087C0226).

Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects

The **Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects** was awarded to Michigan State University in 1987 after a nationwide competition. Funded by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, the Elementary Subjects Center is a major project housed in the Institute for Research on Teaching (IRT). The program focuses on conceptual understanding, higher order thinking, and problem solving in elementary school teaching of mathematics, science, social studies, literature, and the arts. Center researchers are identifying exemplary curriculum, instruction, and evaluation practices in the teaching of these school subjects; studying these practices to build new hypotheses about how the effectiveness of elementary schools can be improved; testing these hypotheses through school-based research; and making specific recommendations for the improvement of school policies, instructional materials, assessment procedures, and teaching practices. Research questions include, What content should be taught when teaching these subjects for understanding and use of knowledge? How do teachers concentrate their teaching to use their limited resources best? and In what ways is good teaching subject matter-specific?

The work is designed to unfold in three phases, beginning with literature review and interview studies designed to elicit and synthesize the points of view of various stakeholders (representatives of the underlying academic disciplines, intellectual leaders and organizations concerned with curriculum and instruction in school subjects, classroom teachers, state- and district-level policymakers) concerning ideal curriculum, instruction, and evaluation practices in these five content areas at the elementary level. Phase II involves interview and observation methods designed to describe current practice, and in particular, best practice as observed in the classrooms of teachers believed to be outstanding. Phase II also involves analysis of curricula (both widely used curriculum series and distinctive curricula developed with special emphasis on conceptual understanding and higher order applications), as another approach to gathering information about current practices. In Phase III, models of ideal practice will be developed, based on what has been learned and synthesized from the first two phases, and will be tested through classroom intervention studies.

The findings of Center research are published by the IRT in the Elementary Subjects Center Series. Information about the Center is included in the IRT Communication Quarterly (a newsletter for practitioners) and in lists and catalogs of IRT publications. For more information, to receive a list or catalog, or to be placed on the IRT mailing list to receive the newsletter, please write to the Editor, Institute for Research on Teaching, 252 Erickson Hall, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824-1034.

Co-directors:	Jere E. Brophy and Penelope L. Peterson
Senior Researchers:	Patricia Cianciolo, Sandra Hollingsworth, Wanda May, Richard Prawat, Ralph Putnam, Taffy Raphael, Cheryl Rosaen, Kathleen Roth, Pamela Schram, Suzanne Wilson
Editor:	Sandra Gross
Editorial Assistant:	Tom Bowden

Abstract

Authors who have reviewed the literature on teaching and learning in U.S. history and in social studies have argued that a need exists for comparative case studies of teachers' history and social studies teaching practices and the influence that these practices have on students. The need, they say, is especially pressing at the elementary school level. This report, which is based on highly detailed, descriptive case studies of how two fifth-grade teachers taught their students about the American Revolution period, summarizes the teachers' teaching practices and compares them, noting how one teacher taught about the period as important in its own right, for its value in acquiring an appreciation of the past. The other teacher taught about the period as an effort to help her students learn about the importance of historical knowledge as a tool in solving problems and in making decisions. The report also outlines how these different teaching practices influenced what students learned and how they described their experiences with the unit. The author concludes by arguing that the teacher who taught her students to think about the American Revolution period as knowledge to be used as a problem-solving and decision-making tool offered her students a broader and richer set of learning opportunities than the other teacher, thereby presenting a stronger example of powerful U.S. history teaching for elementary schools.

STORIES OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION PERIOD: COMPARISONS OF TWO FIFTH-GRADE TEACHERS' CURRICULUM MEDIATION PRACTICES

Bruce A. VanSledright[1]

A review of the social education literature reveals that no systematic or comparative empirical investigation of teachers' curriculum mediation practices has been done to explore the relationship between competing curriculum-teaching-learning orientations to social studies and the advantages and disadvantages of choosing one orientation over another. In a review of research on teaching and learning in social studies education, Armento (1986) observed the need for context-based research on competing goal frameworks in social studies:

> There are a number of major social studies issues that could be examined. For example, given the controversy in the field over competing approaches to social studies education (citizenship transmission, social science, reflective inquiry), it might be informative to know if and how courses and programs operating in these alternative ways contribute to student citizenship outcomes. (p. 944)

Citizenship transmission (C-T), social science (S-S), and reflective inquiry (R-I) refer to the Three Traditions of social studies education described by Barr, Barth, and Shermis (1977). Barr et al. state, "The essence of Citizenship Transmission, as the name suggests, is that adult teachers possess a particular conception of citizenship that they wish all students to share. They use a mixture of techniques to insure that these beliefs are transmitted to their students" (p. 59). The purpose of this tradition hinges on the process of "inculcating right values as a framework for making decisions" (p. 67). The Social Science tradition competes for prominence in social education by suggesting that its purpose should hinge on promoting citizenship through "decision making based on mastery of social science concepts, processes, and problems" (p. 67), rather than on some ostensibly "right" cultural values, beliefs, and attitudes. Its content must therefore revolve around the knowledge generated by structures of the social science disciplines both individually and, where possible, in an integrated fashion. The third tradition, Citizenship as Reflective Inquiry, takes its purview from Dewey's active, participatory, and reflective involvement in a developing democratic vision. It argues that "Citizenship is best promoted through a process of inquiry in

---

[1]Bruce A. VanSledright, an assistant professor in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at the University of Maryland, College Park, was a research assistant with the Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects.

which knowledge is derived from what citizens need to know to make decisions and solve problems. Problems, therefore constitute the content for reflection" (p. 67).

Barr et al. (1977) argued that the C-T Tradition was most common among teachers although verification studies (e.g., White, 1982) were unable to confirm this. Other studies (e.g., Goodman and Adler, 1985) suggested that more orientations than the Three Traditions also existed. However, none of these studies shed much light the comparative influences differing orientations or traditions have on student learning or contextualized curriculum mediation practices, which is Armento's (1986) point and that of others interested in social education research.

Brophy (1990), in his own summary of social studies research, noted that,

> Not much research has been done in social studies classes, and most of the available findings are focused on relatively narrow issues (the effects of questioning students at primarily lower v. primarily higher cognitive levels, the effects of advance organizers on learning from lectures, etc.). The paucity of research is especially noticeable at the elementary level. There have been a few ethnographic studies on how social studies differs according to the socioeconomic status of students (Anyon, 1981; White, 1985), a few descriptive studies of the kinds of instructional methods and activities observed in social studies classes (Marsh, 1987; Stodolsky, 1988), and a few evaluation studies of the effects of various special curricula (e.g., MACOS, values clarification, moral dilemma discussions) on selected student outcomes. However, there has not been systematic descriptive, let alone comparative, research on the implementation and effects of elementary social studies instruction considered holistically (i.e., with attention to purposes, goals, content selection and organization, instructional methods, activities and assignments, and evaluation methods). Information of this kind is badly needed if practice is to become...informed by something other than relatively abstract scholarly debates. Detailed description of what occurs during typical units of exemplary programs taught by outstanding teachers is particularly needed to provide models of excellence for practitioners. (pp. 396-397)

Others, who have examined the social studies research literature, also have noted the absence of descriptive and/or comparative research. For example, Marker and Mehlinger (1992) argue:

> Social studies could profit from in-depth case studies focused on specific classrooms. It is important to observe systematically over an extended period of time how [a] course is mediated by a teacher. Such studies are needed in order to gain more exact understanding of how social studies varies across grade levels, across schools serving different social classes and student abilities, across urban and rural schools, and by subject areas. (p. 847)

Thornton and McCourt-Lewis (1990) describe the need for research on the U.S. history curriculum particularly. They state,

> It is high time for the educational effects of these topics on students to be documented--both to identify what learning, if any, is on target and to determine whether changes or additions to instruction, curriculum, and materials are needed to bring about improvements in learning. A much clearer picture is needed of what teachers, especially

> elementary school teachers, hope to achieve in social studies. [And] there is a great need for ecologically valid investigations tied to actual curriculum being taught in the daily grind of ordinary classrooms to real students. (p. 6-7)

Following a similar thread, Downey and Levstik's (1991) opening line to their chapter in the current *Handbook of Research on Social Studies Teaching and Learning* states that, "The research base for the teaching and learning of history is thin and uneven" (p. 400). They follow this with:

> Much of the professional literature about history teaching consists either of descriptions of exemplary practices, usually reports from the teachers who developed the approach or method, or untried prescriptions for effective teaching. The claims for the exemplary nature of the methods being recommended are seldom supported by evidence of what or how much student learning took place. There is a dearth of research studies on history teaching in large part because little of the research on teaching and learning within the social studies has been discipline-centered. Consequently, most of the systematic research that has been done in history education is of relatively recent origin. A number of areas of critical importance to the field still remain largely unexplored. (p. 400)

To substantiate this last claim, Downey and Levstik (1988) had earlier indicated those unexplored areas of importance. Talking about history education in general, and U.S. history in particular, they argued,

> We know little about how interaction among students, teachers, and others whose influence is felt in the classroom affects how history is taught and learned. We...need more research on how teachers introduce concepts of historical time, and whether current practice contributes to rather than eases the difficulties children have in these areas. We need to develop and test empirically curricula based on new understandings of human cognition that have emerged in recent years. The expanding environments K-6 social studies curriculum [for example] is held in place more by tradition than by a rationale grounded in research. (p. 341)

The relative synonymy of these voices presents a compelling chorus. The research described in this report attempts to address this chorus. The study's principal significance appeals to the empty spaces (i.e., the absence of richly descriptive, comparative case studies) in the research. It also appeals to the need for comparative cases of teaching that can help a range of policymakers and educators better understand the context in which social education occurs. Finally, the study tries to address issues concerning theoretical debates about the curricular direction social education should take. These issues might be framed as follows.

First, in many school districts across the country, fifth grade serves as the introductory experience for learning systematic, often chronologically arranged U.S. history. United States history has been and continues to be the central and pivotal feature of the social studies curriculum. Typically, systematic treatment of U.S. history occurs in grades five, eight, and 10 or 11. No other social studies subject matter

recurs with such frequency, determination, and systematization. In fact, some (see Bradley Commission, 1989; Ravitch, 1987) believe it to be so important that they suggest beginning, insofar as developmentally possible, its systematic study earlier, perhaps at grade two. This raises important questions about how much U.S. history should be taught and how early it should begin. For additional discussion of this issue and the next, see VanSledright (1992a).

And second, debates between advocates of "more history," or "more citizenship education," or "more developmentally friendly" social education curricula have continued almost unabated since the birth of "The Social Studies" in 1916 (see Barr et al., 1977; Jenness, 1990; Leming, 1989; Shaver, 1981, 1987). Curricular questions of what, when, and why turn principally on pragmatic dilemmas that evolve as educational communities and cultures grow. They remain pragmatic questions with ethical, axiological, and aesthetic implications governing the future images of social studies education which interested communities wish to develop in schools (Grant & VanSledright, 1991). Describing how teachers and students interpret their curricular, teaching, and learning contexts can help policymakers and practitioner-theorists with a more empirically informed basis upon which to build their images.

To begin to address some of these issues and the need for comparative cases of teaching, this study focused on one area (social studies) of the teaching lives of two veteran fifth-grade teachers. The teachers thought about social studies in different ways: one teacher, Sara Atkinson (all teachers', students', and school names are pseudonyms), viewed the content of social studies as a tool to stimulate reflective thinking and decision making processes; the other teacher, Ramona Palmer, viewed the content as important in itself and attempted to make it interesting and lively. Attention was focused on how the two teachers mediated the social studies curriculum--a unit on the American Revolution-Constitutional period--and to what ends. Comparisons were made between the two teachers with respect to their curriculum mediation practices and the influences that these practices had on their fifth-grade students. The trade-offs involved in choosing to mediate the curriculum in different ways were examined in detail. The implications that those trade-offs suggest for curriculum and teaching debates in the field of social education were also considered.

The research was framed around three questions: (a) In what specific ways do the two fifth-grade teachers mediate the social studies curriculum and what factors influence their decisions? (b) How do those decisions in turn influence the ways in which their students construct an understanding of the American Revolution-Constitutional period studied in the unit under investigation? and (c) What differences do the decisions make in relationship to the plurality of social education goals? The first question received consistently greater emphasis than the other two. This resulted from the assumption made throughout the study that the teachers' curriculum mediation practices provided the key to understanding student learning possibilities and the relative viability of differing goal frameworks.

Data Collection Methods

The research began by the selection of two teachers willing to participate as primary informants. To solicit participation, preliminary interviews were obtained with potential candidates. The interviews sought to determine the eligibility of participants based on a number of criteria relative to the questions asked in the study. The criteria included (a) elementary teachers responsible for teaching the social studies-U.S. history curriculum, (b) both teachers teaching in the same school district, following the same specified district curriculum, with commensurate student populations relative to socioeconomic status, but differing in their orientations and approaches to the social studies-U.S. history curriculum as defined by the differing orientations presented in the literature (e.g., Barr et al., 1977; Martorella, 1985), (c) indication of commitment and interest in teaching social studies (U.S. history) in elementary school, (d) indication of extensive experience in teaching elementary school children as defined by years of service, (e) indication of extended, post-B.A. educational experience and qualifications, and (f) highly recommended by peers and supervisors as committed social studies teachers. Fifth grade provided the greatest hope of locating two teachers that met all the criteria.

In selection interviews, the teachers were asked a series of questions designed to address each criterion. For example, teachers were queried about their autobiographies, years of teaching experience, degrees, commitments and interests in social education, nature of the school district (student population, intended fifth-grade social studies curriculum, relative socioeconomic status of the district and individual schools), and how they conceived of themselves as teachers. They were also asked to briefly describe

some of their more interesting and enjoyable social studies-U.S. history teaching experiences of the past school year. Finally, in order to determine differences in orientation and approaches toward purposes of and teaching about social studies, teachers were asked to assess their own positions by rank ordering their perceived relationship to the Three Traditions coupled with two additional categories from Martorella's (1985) five approaches (social studies as human relations and as personal development).

Based upon these preliminary interviews and the applications of the criteria indicated, Atkinson and Palmer were selected and agreed to participate in the study. Both teachers taught in the same school district, educated comparable student populations (middle- to upper-middle class socioeconomic class backgrounds), and utilized the same intended district social studies curriculum. Both came highly recommended by peers and supervisory colleagues, had attained master's degrees (one in social studies, the other in elementary education), were veteran teachers (both had been teaching for 25 years), thought of themselves as good teachers, and were interested and committed to high quality social studies education for their students. Palmer, the teacher with the advanced degree in social studies, described herself as oriented more to the Social Science approach. Atkinson, likened herself more to the Reflective Inquiry approach.

Once the teachers had had a chance to establish classroom organization in the fall (1991), extensive interviews with each teacher began (see Structured Teacher Interview protocol in Appendix A). The teachers were asked to reiterate relevant aspects of their autobiographies, describe their general and specific philosophy of teaching and learning in social studies, identify their goals for fifth-grade U.S. history education, discuss content selection and curricular organization, content representation, use of classroom discourse, activities and assignments, assessment practices, and applications of teaching for understanding, critical thinking, and decision making. In addition, each teacher was asked to describe in detail how the above areas of concern were addressed specifically (or not) in the unit (the American Revolution-Constitutional period) the study directly examined. Also, the two teachers were asked to respond to a series of questions designed to provide more information about their orientations to social studies. Finally, they were asked to identify where they stood in reference to a number of the debates advanced by social educators, social scientists, and child development specialists. Additionally, as the

units progressed, both teachers were informally interviewed almost daily so the research could stay abreast of modifications in teaching plans, clarifications of points addressed in the structured interviews, and other matters that emerged in the daily pace of the classroom.

The subject matter content that served as the principal focus of the study involved the American Revolution-Constitutional period unit. This unit was selected for several reasons. First, because it typically entails an initial introduction to the "birth of the democratic tradition" in this country and has significant implications for a variety of citizenship education purposes (some of which are espoused as central to the mission of the social studies), it warranted extended case study treatment (McKeown & Beck, 1990; Thornton & McCourt-Lewis, 1990). Second, it involved subject matter that both teachers spent considerable time teaching (6 weeks), had expressed personal interest in, and had indicated a strong commitment to as important for young children. And third, because it represented a historical period with various and conflicting interpretations (which some historians have found compelling), it served as a means for understanding the degrees of interpretive difference that influenced each teacher's curriculum mediation practices.

To obtain information about what students learned as a result of their experience with the unit, several data collection methods were used. Prior to teaching the unit, both teachers were asked to select a stratified sample (by achievement and gender: three males and three females, two higher achievers, two middle-level achievers, and two lower achievers; one of each sex at each stratum) of six students to be interviewed using a structured student interview protocol (see Appendix C). Additionally, each teacher was introduced to a K-W-L form (Ogle, 1986; see Appendix B) and asked to administer it before and after the unit. These two procedures were augmented also by daily informal conversations with students as the unit progressed and a collection of student work samples.

Once the teachers began teaching, fieldnotes were compiled for each class session and all relevant documents were collected. Each lesson was also audiotaped and portions of these tapes were later transcribed for analysis. Atkinson taught 22 55-minute lessons (approximately 1210 minutes) and Palmer taught 26 45-minute lessons (approximately 1170 minutes).

Data Analysis Procedures

Teacher Interviews

After the structured teacher interviews were completed and transcribed, a summary description was written for each teacher's autobiographical characteristics, orientation to social studies, general process of curricular decision making, general social education goals and rationales, goals and rationales for fifth-grade U.S. history, knowledge representation strategies (for U.S. history), activities and assignments, text materials used, classroom discourse processes, assessment practices, teaching for understanding, critical thinking and decision making efforts, and the specifics of each of the above for the unit on the American Revolution. These areas served as categories that organized the interview protocol and the subsequent analysis process.[2] As the summary descriptions were reconstructed from interview transcripts, efforts were made to note themes and counter-themes in what the teachers said about their goals, curriculum mediation practices, and teaching lives.

These summary descriptions served several other data analysis purposes. They were used against the backdrop of classroom events and in relationship to the documents the teachers used for the purpose of triangulating the data and addressing further forms of evidence that supported or disconfirmed teachers' self-portrayals and the themes and counter-themes generated about those self-portrayals (Glaser & Strauss, 1975; Goetz & LeCompte, 1981). Once the descriptions had been reanalyzed and reconstructed several times as a result of the above procedures, they became the source of the introductory sections to each specific case study (see VanSledright, 1992b, 1992c). Here, efforts were made to incorporate the teachers' voices into the descriptions of who they were and what they believed they were about when they taught social studies in general and U.S. history in particular.

---

[2]The protocol itself was developed earlier by Jere Brophy and the author to be used in a wide-ranging Elementary Teacher Interview Study. The categories derive from characteristics many teachers, scholars, and researchers in the social studies field believe are important aspects of social education. Not all the categories represented in the protocol were relevant to this study and, therefore, some were omitted from the analysis procedure. However, the information the teachers supplied based on protocol questions was intended to be used in the Interview Study as well, so all the questions were asked.

Observations and Fieldnotes

Observations were conducted on each teacher's unit lessons from beginning to conclusion of the unit. All lessons were audiotaped and organized by the dates on which they occurred. Fieldnotes also were compiled on all lessons and on the teachers' informal comments about those lessons. Portions of the audio tapes were transcribed to aid the process of adding verbatim discourse exchanges between the teachers and the students. No a priori coding schemes were used to organize the lesson content short of chronological sequence and salience with regard to the research questions. The purpose involved constructing detailed, narrative descriptions of daily classroom events complete with verbatim discussions. These narrative accounts were later to comprise extended sections of the case studies (VanSledright, 1992b, 1992c).

Teaching Documents

Relevant documents were collected and labeled by description and date at all phases of the data collection process. Documents collected included district curriculum guidelines, teacher-made classroom advance organizers, activities and assignments, text and descriptions of audiovisual materials, and other such items that pertained to the unit. Documents were also used for triangulation purposes, that is, they were systematically used to check interpretive categories based on teacher and student interviews and fieldnote and observation data.

Student Work Sample Documents

All student work samples were analyzed specifically to inform interpretations of the learning process and address the second research question. The work samples were analyzed in relationship to the goals the teachers expressed within the context in which the activity or assignment occurred. As one might expect, the activities and the goals sought varied with the differences in mediation practices. For example, Palmer assigned students to read, make presentations, and write a report on a variety of historical fiction accounts of the people and events that occurred during the American Revolution period. Her goal, she said, involved helping students to "internalize" the content by developing some empathy and understanding for the plight of Revolutionary War period actors. The student work samples that emerged from this activity were analyzed with this criterion in mind. Descriptions of these teacher-specific

assignments and the way they were assessed and analyzed are described in detail in each case study (VanSledright, 1992b, 1992c).

One work sample permitted cross-case analysis and comparison. This involved a publisher-supplied test (on the Silver Burdett & Ginn textbook, Chapter 7; Helmus, Toppin, Pounds, & Arndorf, 1988) that both teachers chose to administer to their students. Although the tests were identical, the teachers chose to assess the essay questions differently. These differences are described and contextually analyzed in the case study chapters. Despite the differences, the test presented students with the same set of 35 multiple-choice questions where both teachers classified answers as either correct or incorrect based on a supplied answer key. Mean and median scores were computed for each class and then compared.[3]

K-W-L Forms

The first two sections of the K-W-L instrument ("What do I know?" and "What do I want to know?"; see Appendix B) were administered as requested by each teacher to their entire class (present on that day) approximately a week prior to beginning the American Revolution-Constitutional period unit. At the conclusion of the unit, the final section ("What have I learned?") was completed. Once the forms were completed, photocopies were made and then the originals were returned to each teacher to use for their own purposes.

The K-W-L forms served to augment structured and informal student interview data by broadening the sample size. The forms provided descriptive data that were used to interpret and understand the extent to which each teacher succeeded in addressing her goals for the unit. These conclusions helped to inform descriptions of the relative advantages and disadvantages of the teachers' respective orientations. Combined with the student interview data, the K-W-Ls added some depth to making sense of the relative influence of each teacher's curriculum mediation practices.

The data generated by the K-W-L forms were analyzed without a priori coding schemes. Initially, all student responses were paraphrased. Care was taken to retain verbatim phrases and clauses used by

---

3A t-test was conducted to compare the means but proved to be statistically insignificant. Nevertheless, the results were of some interest. They are presented comparatively in Table 5 (see Appendix E).

the students. Once the paraphrased responses were listed, the list was searched for similarities in language use and apparent meaning. Ongoing judgments were made about the similarities of responses, using language similarity as the primary criterion. Generally, if a student's language use differed significantly from that used by other students, although the meaning was judged to be quite similar, the response was nevertheless taken as "new" and listed separately. As a result, long lists of responses were generated that, to another analyst, could be shortened by using a sophisticated coding scheme. The purpose here, however, was to retain as many qualitative differences as possible and still present that data in concise, table form.

For table presentation purposes, several categories were employed to organize the responses for the first and third K-W-L questions (the second-question responses appear virtually verbatim in the tables). These categories included references to (a) Names, Events, and Terms, (b) Causal Relationships, and (c) General Ideas (or responses that appeared not to fit in the other categories). These categories were developed post facto for the principal purpose of arranging the numerous responses and making the tables easier to read. They also helped organize the data for comparative purposes. The categories were not necessarily mutually exclusive. Some student responses could be categorized in several different places. Judgments about placements were based on logical deductions related to the categories.

Student Interview Data

The student interview data were used to augment the K-W-L forms and student work samples. Both pre- and post-unit interviews (see Appendices C & D) for all 12 students (six from each class; each given a pseudonym) were audiotaped and transcribed. The transcription process involved verbatim reconstructions of students' written responses. These transcripts were edited to remove identifying proper nouns and to enhance word and punctuation clarity, although the latter changes were kept to a minimum. The ensuing analysis procedure remained quite similar to that used for the K-W-Ls. Students' responses were paraphrased using verbatim language samples (e.g., words, phrases, clauses). If responses shared the same language, they were classified as the "same" response. If the language appeared to vary, a "new" response category was created. Again, fairly extensive lists of student

responses appear in the tables constructed to organize the data. Often, only one student response appears in a response category although it may appear to be quite similar to other response categories. This came as a consequence of applying the language-use criterion.

The student interview tables were constructed by pre-post question pairs to organize the students' responses, initially separately for each class and then later, comparatively. Rather than provide extended quotations from a varying sample of students in each class, a decision was made to make all student responses, albeit in paraphrased form, available within the table format. This decision was made based on the belief that, in this case, the table style would more adequately serve the need for transparent data presentation. However, on occasion, salient verbatim responses were also included.

Member Checks

One additional analysis method was employed. "Member checks" (Guba & Lincoln, 1981, p. 120) involve a data analysis strategy whereby the researcher submits a description of the research subject and his or her practices to that subject for consideration and assessment. In the case of the teachers in this study, a preliminary draft of what was to become one of the case study chapters was given to each teacher for her perusal. Two subsequent meetings were scheduled. During these meetings (approximately one hour per meeting with each teacher), the case study draft was discussed. The teachers were asked to comment on the categories, themes, counter themes, and general descriptions and conclusions reached in the draft. In this way, the members checked the viability of the descriptions against their own frames of reference.

Disagreements with the descriptions turned out to be minimal. However, small changes were made (mostly in the nature and detail of their understanding of certain events) in the case studies to reflect comments the teachers made. Both teachers appeared reasonably satisfied with the descriptive categories, themes, and conclusions. If anything, they both tended to be more critical of their own practices than the case studies indicated.

Summary of Case Study Findings

The following summaries supply only a generalized set of findings. For more details about each teacher, specifics on how the lessons were organized and taught, and information about the students, see VanSledright (1992b, 1992c).

The Case of Ramona Palmer

Palmer taught at Matewan Elementary School, a comprehensive K-5 school with a largely middle- to upper-middle-class population of 400 students. The school was located in a medium-size city in the northern Midwest. The student body was approximately 90% Caucasian. Of the remaining 10%, about 6% were African Americans and 4% were Asian Americans. There were 28 students in Palmer's class. Three were African Americans (11%) and three were Asian Americans (11%), reflecting a slightly higher proportion of minorities than for the school as a whole.

In teaching the American Revolution unit, Palmer employed a variety of pedagogical strategies (games, audiovisual experiences, a simulation, projects and presentations, writing, and discussion) designed to move her fifth graders systematically toward the goals she had set: (a) making history come alive by using this variety of teaching strategies and activities, (b) making it "internally exciting" by attempting to connect it to children's lives, (c) fostering empathy and imagination through storytelling and historical fiction, and (d) creating a context for learning and building initial ideas about and appreciation for the sequence of events and the personalities that produced one of the more memorable periods in the U.S. historical tradition.

In interviews, Palmer defined social studies, in part, as school subjects. Her personal philosophy and general social studies goals, such as developing personal responsibility for learning, cultural awareness and tolerance for diversity, and fostering a degree of patriotism, were implicitly folded into the rubric of teaching and learning history. Her undergraduate liberal arts exposure to disciplinary history (and the other social sciences) and an early teaching experience with the anthropology-based Man: A Course of Study (MACOS) course appeared to promote the encapsulation of her more general goals within the context of historical study. In short, for her purposes in fifth grade, social studies was history, and history was defined by the practitioners of history (textbook and historical fiction authors). In this way, one might

argue that Palmer most nearly represented what Barr et al. (1977) refer to as a teacher in the "social science tradition." However, to draw this conclusion alone is misleading.

Palmer also demonstrated characteristics of the "citizenship transmission tradition" combined with traces of a "human relations-style" approach (Goodman & Adler, 1985; Martorella, 1985). She also manifested a degree of what Martorella called the "social action" approach (similar to the R-I Tradition). Her belief in the importance of the *Bill of Rights* also suggested this influence and her two-day discussion of its implications with her students near the end of the unit at least implicitly pointed to a reflective inquiry, decision-making orientation (see VanSledright, 1992b). Although Palmer most resembled a teacher in the social science tradition, evidence of the presence of the other traditions and approaches (Barr et al., 1977; Martorella, 1985) indicated that she should not be so easily classified.

By itself, Palmer's case offered an example of what reasonably strong fifth-grade social studies teaching might be if focused on the importance of academic knowledge and understanding in U.S. history. It was strong in the sense that students left the unit with a considerably enhanced appreciation of the American Revolution-Constitutional period. In general, they recalled many details and indicated some initial understanding of causal relationships. A number of students stated interest in the period (in formal and informal interviews and on the K-W-Ls) and their classroom activity and involvement in the lessons suggested that they found much of the material stimulating and memorable. Palmer arranged to teach the unit in depth and to build it around important ideas and clear goals which appeared to be effectively communicated to students.

The Case of Sara Atkinson

Atkinson was a sprightly, effervescent, and talkative veteran of 25 years of elementary school teaching. She taught fifth grade at Greenwood Elementary, which is a predominantly Caucasian, middle- to upper-middle-class school of 250 students in the same medium-sized district and metropolitan area in which Palmer taught. Born and raised on the East Coast, she pursued a postsecondary education in the Midwest, receiving bachelor of arts and master of arts degrees from a Michigan university. As an undergraduate, she completed a language arts major and science and social science dual minors. She had taught sixth grade until the advent of middle schools at which point she transferred to fifth grade.

Atkinson's own childhood had a significant impact on her attitudes toward the subject matter of U.S. history particularly. The power of her own "New England" oral tradition imbued in her a sense of the past that she strove to communicate to her students. Her sense of this oral tradition was coupled with the belief that, at its center, the concept of democracy--citizen rights and responsibilities--flourished. For her, this oral tradition was democracy: the right to argue, negotiate, participate, and decide; a process she said was practiced in her family as far back as she could remember. Her perception of this democratic tradition had become the historical, curricular thread with which she tried to weave the classroom.

Atkinson's goals turned on constructing a classroom in the spirit of a participatory, democratic ethos. For Atkinson, that ethos was characterized by a context in which individual rights and personal responsibilities were often at issue, discussion of issues proliferated, knowledge claims were understood as tools which gave substance to the process of learning, and reflective decision making and informed action were desired dispositions. The data on student learning appeared to support Atkinson's success at communicating many of these goals to her students. Atkinson intended to bring life to a participatory definition of democracy (Barber, 1989; Gutmann, 1987). Bringing this participatory definition into her classroom, along with spending the time-consuming activities that its practice required, detracted comparatively little from what students learned about the events and details of the American Revolution-Constitutional period. As such, her students appeared to acquire as much knowledge about the period as Palmer's despite different goals.

Atkinson's social studies teaching approach and classroom organization seemed to embody what Barr et al. (1977) referred to as the reflective inquiry tradition. Atkinson's emphasis on opposing viewpoints, problem solving, and decision making, where claims to historical knowledge serve as a starting point rather than ends in themselves, pointed to this tradition.

However, Atkinson also embodied a number of characteristics of the other traditions and approaches (see Martorella, 1985) as well. For example, her use of textbook recitations could be understood as exercises in knowledge transmission. At this level, one could argue that she favored what Barr et al. (1977) referred to as citizenship transmission. Other evidence suggested that Atkinson manifested some of what Martorella (1985) termed the human relations and development approach to

teaching social studies. Atkinson, like Palmer, turned out to be rather eclectic in her curriculum mediation practices.

Implications From the Case Studies

Understanding Differences Between the Teachers

A helpful way to interpret Palmer's and Atkinson's curriculum gatekeeping practices involves examining in more detail the differences in their background experience, the assumptions they make about themselves, the subject matter, their students, the context in which they teach, and their definitions of social studies teaching and learning goals. At the outset, it is important to note two things. First, the salient differences that frame much of the following discussion must be understood as interactive, that is, by example, background experiences influence personal circumstances which in turn influence assumptions and mediation practices (and, to a degree, vice versa). And second, despite important differences, Palmer and Atkinson remain much alike in important ways. They both demonstrate a significant commitment to their work and live lives devoted to teaching, regard the welfare of their students as the core of their purpose, reflect appreciation for the importance of social studies as a major contributor to the elementary school curriculum, provide a rich array of social studies learning opportunities, struggle to cope with the pressures dictated by the dilemmas they must manage, and pursue powerful teaching-learning classroom environments. However, these similarities will receive only limited treatment here. Differences remain the most salient feature.

Autobiographical and circumstantial differences influenced the ways in which Palmer and Atkinson mediated the social studies curriculum. The biographical sketches provided in each case study (VanSledright 1992b, 1992c) indicate how life history and personal experience relate to how Palmer and Atkinson view social studies/U.S. history. Palmer's liberal arts education in a small Catholic college, the mentorship she received from certain influential teachers and professors, the influence of the "New Social Studies" era, and the rigors of life as preparation for religious service appeared to play roles in how she came to understand herself as a social studies teacher. Analysis of the transcript data suggested that Palmer made a distinction between teaching social studies and teaching U.S. history. For her, social studies was an amalgam of social interaction and study skills and dispositions (e.g., personal responsibility)

coupled with smatterings of content area skills (e.g. map reading, latitude and longitude, timelines). United States history emerged in her discussions as "the thing itself"; that is, she defined it as somewhat distinct from "social studies." Social studies did not "come alive," history did. Social studies was life; it had an implied quality as in: "one does social studies throughout the day." History was explicit school subject matter, requiring the breath of life. History was content to be understood and mastered. To listen to Palmer carefully was to hear this distinction, and the distinction played itself out in her curriculum deliberations.

For Palmer social studies went on all day long. In fact it seemed to be the great integrator of the curriculum (Goodman & Adler, 1985). History had a subject matter slot in the day, much like mathematics and spelling. In her view, history possessed an academic knowledge base that she brought with her to the classroom from her graduate and undergraduate learning experiences. That historical knowledge, the imagination and empathy it inspired, the way it portrayed "our" important, collective heritage, and the methods by which it could be brought to life were all important to Palmer's teaching efforts. For Palmer, understanding academic history required personal, intellectual discipline. This type of discipline was consonant with what Palmer experienced at home, in grade school, in college, and as she trained to become a nun. However, the personal, intellectual discipline and the self-identified autocratic characteristics of Palmer's personality appeared as only part of a somewhat disparate and conflicted set of influences.

Palmer's mother taught her about making discerning choices, about being open-minded and assertive, and about how her mother had paid a price for it (without specifying the nature of that price). In formal interviews and in informal conversations, Palmer spoke of difficulties that arose for her when she was likewise assertive and expressed dissension from school policies or community norms. Therefore, she noted, "I learned to keep my mouth shut about some things." However, she highly valued the rights guaranteed by the *Constitution* and demonstrated it, for example, by spending several class periods discussing those rights with her students in animated detail (see VanSledright, 1992b). But when her students asked for her opinion about where she stood on the issue of capital punishment, she initially refused to provide one, citing school policy as the reason. However, when the students begged, Palmer

provided a middling, cautious response. These vacillations appeared fairly commonly in the interviews and in the classroom. She would say, for instance, that she limited classroom discussion and then spend two class periods engrossed in a stimulating exploration of the *Bill of Rights* or spend a class session soliciting students' opinions on British tax policy.

In contrast with Palmer, Atkinson folded history into social studies. History became a tool she used to address her social studies goals. These goals involved reflecting on historical knowledge and using it as the substance for explicitly dealing with issues that required problem solving and decision making. Atkinson's classroom became a site where historical knowledge claims were first read and examined (e.g., textbook recitations), then analyzed and discussed with regard to how historical actors had made decisions and how they might have been made differently. Students were frequently encouraged to question what they read, to form opinions, and to express those opinions in class. In Atkinson's frame of reference (Beard, 1934), history and social studies remained connected; the former was generally pressed into the service of the latter. This frame of reference can be traced, in part, to her East coast background, her immersion into a form of "New England town-meeting democracy," and family members who prided themselves on the value inherent in questioning assertions and debating issues. She melded this orientation with her social studies goals and, in doing so, used historical knowledge as the intellectual substance for reaching those goals.

However, having said this, one must also note how, in ways quite akin to Palmer, Atkinson could be observed teaching history as a distinct subject matter, as the "thing itself." In informal interviews, Atkinson indicated that she did this for two reasons. First, she believed that her students lacked sufficient knowledge of the story of U.S. history and therefore were unprepared to discuss, for example, what she perceived to be "the mistakes of history" (e.g., treatment of women, slavery). Her recitations in the unit were designed to fill in the knowledge gaps. Second, Atkinson felt some content coverage pressures. In an informal conversation late in the study, Atkinson noted that the task of preparing her students for middle school influenced her classroom and curriculum mediation practices more than she typically indicated in earlier interviews. She said that she wanted her students to be clearly distinguishable from other teachers' students when they got to middle school. Her students were to be the ones who, in

middle school social studies classes, were alert, interested, wanted to argue the issues, and asked good questions. But she also wanted them "to know something about history" and be able to clearly demonstrate it.

In short, she wanted it all: students with an good grasp of historical knowledge along with a well-honed ability to reflect, question, and discuss. However, to do both, given the district demand that she "cover" explorers through Vietnam and her own need to prepare her students for middle school, presented her with a curricular deliberation dilemma she confronted each day. Discussion of and argumentation over historical issues and "mistakes" often involved extended blocks of time. Sometimes science would be eliminated if the discussion in social studies piqued student interest while fitting her problem-solving, decision-making approach. On other occasions, the discussion would be cut off in favor of content coverage. Her protracted illness and missed teaching opportunities exacerbated the tensions produced by the time factor and the content coverage dilemma. For more details concerning this illness, see Atkinson's case study (VanSledright, 1992c).

Informal conversations and portions of the structured interviews with each teacher suggested that time and content coverage issues were central dilemmas which had impact on their curriculum deliberations. Although both Palmer and Atkinson apparently possessed considerable autonomy over the curriculum decision-making process, perceived pressures to get through the book, to meet the district guidelines, and to prepare students for middle school influenced their choices by making them feel more aware of constraints placed on learning opportunities that consumed large portions of valuable time. There were interesting differences in how they dealt with these perceived constraints.

Palmer foregrounded history as subject matter. She pushed her students hard to develop an understanding of the content (facts, events, people) and purposefully constructed a more tightly controlled (autocratic) classroom environment which, by its nature, placed limits on how far she and her students would go in analyzing and discussing what they were learning. However, she appeared compelled, on occasion, to engage her students in some critical discussion of issues she found most robust (e.g., *The Bill of Rights*). In this way, Palmer tried to stay consistent with the no-nonsense, subject-matter ethos that permeated Matewan School, its reputation, and its administrative leadership.

Atkinson often remained more combative when facing what she thought to be the imposition of constraints. Perceived limitations, particularly when she felt they were "handed down," tended to violate the more democratic atmosphere she valued and attempted to create in her classroom. Atkinson pursued a sense of autonomy more explicitly and with greater determination than did Palmer. Where Palmer "learned to keep my mouth shut," Atkinson sometimes did precisely the opposite. As an example of her style, here is a brief anecdote. Late in the study, Atkinson received a memo from the principal at Greenwood announcing cancellation of a picnic for the student street-crossing guards. Atkinson immediately fired off a letter to the district curriculum and instruction administrator requesting (demanding might be a better word) that the principal be overruled and the picnic be reinstated. She also commented (negatively) on the principal's leadership style by noting that the teachers had not been "polled to see what would work out best for us or our students." At last report, the issue had not be resolved. The anecdote conveys a sense of Atkinson's contentious, questioning nature, one that was often in evidence in the classroom, and one that influenced her perception about the role of U.S. history relative to her social studies curriculum mediation practices and goals. However, her contentiousness came with a price.

Atkinson's life seemed to be one of perpetual motion, especially the teaching part of it which, by her reckoning, occupied virtually her entire waking period five to six days a week, 180+ days per year. Her interest in the participatory aspects of democracy led her to solicit student and parent comments about her class and the procedures and activities she employed. At conference time, she would arrange 10-minute conversations with each of her students and then couple this with a second set of conversations (20 minutes each) with the parent(s) and their child again (if parents wanted the child to be involved). She would report on the child's progress of course but also would encourage parents to make suggestions for improving, not only the student but the teaching procedures as well. These conferences occurred before school in the morning, after school in the afternoon, and on some evenings. It took her approximately four weeks to complete them all while she taught almost seven hours per day. Of note, her illness, her bout with pneumonia followed the conclusion of these conferences by one week (see again VanSledright, 1992c for additional details).

When confronted by the dilemma concerning the kinds of learning opportunities to provide students (e.g., covering the material in the book and the specified curriculum, engaging in critical analysis and inquiry into relevant issues, devoting time to stimulate thoughtfulness about the U.S. history content), Palmer tended toward what McNeil (1986) termed a "negotiation of efficiencies" strategy that foregrounded interest in the subject matter, chronology, and details of U.S. history for their own sake. Questioning, interpretative processes, and discussion played a secondary role. Atkinson tended to pursue a strategy of foregrounding her social studies or citizenship education goals while simultaneously making learning about the American Revolution itself important in service to those goals. However, Atkinson's approach was time-consuming, and the clock was often her enemy.

These observations are not designed to suggest that Palmer did a better job managing curriculum mediation dilemmas because she was more efficient, or by contrast, that Atkinson was more effective because she pursued a perhaps richer set of goals. The observations are meant to point out the different ways in which these two teachers confronted and managed curriculum dilemmas.

Contemporaneous personal circumstances may well have played some role in Palmer's and Atkinson's mediation practices as well. For example, Atkinson's two children were both grown and no longer depended on her for direct financial support. Her husband worked in a highly remunerated professional position. Although Atkinson said that her teaching position provided her with psychic rewards, she also noted that, if she chose to take an early retirement (a possibility she raised on several occasions, often after an extremely hectic week of teaching), she and her husband could live quite comfortably on his salary alone. She also mentioned twice that, if the school district opted for a longer school year (a possibility they were considering), she would quit. In one informal conversation where the subject of teaching controversial issues had come up, she stated flatly that, if parents or district administrators made significant or extended trouble for her because of the way in which she addressed a delicate issue, she might elect an early retirement option. Perceiving as she did that she could "retire" if she so chose at the end of almost any school year may have made her more confident in pursuing her questioning, argumentative style.

By contrast, Palmer was a divorced mother of two dependent adolescents. She received some child support, but not enough for the three of them to live on. Early retirement was not an option from Palmer's perspective. She valued her position for its psychic rewards, but also needed it as the source of economic livelihood. This, in part, may have influenced the degree to which she felt she could challenge accepted practices at Matewan and defer substantively from the strong focus on academics and textbook knowledge. Palonsky (1987) states, "Public schools seem trapped by the often conflicting predicament of trying to teach democratic values while maintaining order. The forces of order, however, have a stronger public lobby than the forces of democracy" (p. 500). Palmer tended to be more sensitive to the "public lobby," and perhaps needed to be given her personal circumstances, than Atkinson (although Atkinson was probably not unaffected).

What I have been describing relates to Boyd's (1979) concept of the zone of tolerance. Boyd argues that how a teacher interprets the boundaries of the zone (or context) in which she teaches will likely influence a number of choices she makes about her teaching practices. Autobiographical factors (see Connelly & Clandinin, 1990; Butt et al., 1988), personal circumstances, and definitions and assumptions about the community, curriculum, teaching, and learning (see Thornton, 1991) may all play a role in how teachers interpret the zone of tolerance. This interpretation in turn may influence how teachers choose to mediate the curriculum. Comparisons of Palmer and Atkinson suggest the hypothesis that (a) the more a teacher perceives the public lobby (Palonsky, 1987) to be active, vocal, and control-oriented, (b) the more the teacher feels psychic and practical needs for the teaching position, and (c) the greater the consonance between the teacher's belief system and that of the community, then the more circumscribed and conservative the teacher's curriculum mediation practices will become.[4]

Although quite similar in some ways, Palmer and Atkinson remain different in many others. So what difference, if any, do these differences make with regard to what students learned about the American Revolution and how this learning influenced their attitudes and dispositions? In what follows, I

---

[4]If this hypothesis has merit, a number of Atkinson's practices appear rather anomalous. Perhaps, she perceived herself to be an iconoclast, a role she had grown accustomed to at Greenwood; but the pressure it sometimes created may have helped engender her talk of "early retirement." This is merely speculative. Nevertheless, the hypothesis itself may warrant further consideration by interested social education researchers.

comparatively examine the student data (K-W-L forms, interviews, tests). I then use criteria generated by the work of Reed (1989) and Newmann (1990) to elaborate on these comparisons.

Comparisons of Student Learning

K-W-L Forms

A comparative examination of the K-W-L forms (see Tables 1, 2, 3 in Appendix E) indicates quite dramatic differences, particularly on the L section but also to a lesser degree on the prior knowledge (K) and the questions (W) sections. In general, Palmer's students had much more to say in almost every category (e.g., Names, Events, Terms, etc.) on the K section than did Atkinson's (Table 1). They appeared to have a slightly broader grasp of the period's people, events, terms, causal relationships, and general ideas. Six of Atkinson's students said they knew very little or nothing about the period to be studied, whereas, only one student from Palmer's class said the same. The notable differences between the student groups in the Names, Events, and Terms category occurred primarily with reference to Paul Revere, his famous ride, details about the battles during the war, and several terms that a few students in Palmer's class mentioned. The frequency of Palmer's students' reference to Paul Revere, his famous ride, and the early battles of the Revolution resulted from their exposure to this story in historical fiction form in fourth grade.

For causal relationships, differences were less dramatic. Several of Palmer's students logically deduced that Americans had won the war, but only a handful of students in each class had much knowledge of causal developments. Two students in each class believed that "the Americans" had started the war and one student in Palmer's class confused the American Revolution with the Civil War. Two of Atkinson's students knew that the war was fought over freedom (at least from a U.S. perspective), but no one from Palmer's class mentioned this.

Palmer's students offered considerably more general ideas about the period than did Atkinson's. A bit surprisingly, one of Palmer's students knew about the Hessians hired by "the Brits," she said, to fight against the colonists. Another student in Palmer's class misguidedly thought that the Revolution was fought between the French and the Americans, perhaps a reference to the French and Indian War. The most common responses in each class (Atkinson's: "It was a revolution; a war"; Palmer's: "Many people

died") were responses that seemed to be fairly logical deductions based on general familiarity with the term The American Revolution and an understanding that war frequently results in many casualties. In general, prior knowledge of the period appeared sketchy at best for both classes. Palmer's students provided more details and seemed to have more to offer at the outset. However, the nature of the two teachers' treatment of the K-W-L exercise was a mitigating factor which must be considered when comparing the classes. More on this later.

Table 2 depicts virtually verbatim all of the questions asked by each group of students. Clearly, Palmer's students asked many, many more questions than did Atkinson's. Over half of Atkinson's students were content to state that they wanted to know everything or anything and leave it at that. Only three of Palmer's students responded in the same fashion. On the whole, Palmer's students produced more specific questions and a much wider range of them. "How and why they fought?" and "When it happened?" were favorites. The vast differences evident here also can be traced to the differential treatment given these forms by the teachers.

Taken by itself, Table 3 suggests that Palmer's students emerged from studying the revolutionary period with a much greater general and specific recall of key terms, events, people, causal relationships and general ideas than did Atkinson's. The differences are rather startling. Atkinson's then-recent emphasis on the *Constitution* and the struggle over its ratification became salient for her students. This salience appeared in the case of the importance of the Boston Tea Party (as a compelling causal incident) and the general role of women in the war as well. However, beyond these factors, her students did not appear to display an appreciable gain in their knowledge following the unit. With the exception of references to the process of creating and ratifying the *Constitution* (Palmer did very little with this), Palmer's students showed significant gains in each category. Their knowledge of the period appeared broader, more connected, and much more sensitive to historical details and facts.

There are at least two possible interpretations of the K-W-L data analyses. On the surface, the K-W-L forms indicate that Palmer's emphasis on an appreciation of the American Revolution period, on its actors and actresses, what they did, and with what results had a powerful influence on what her students were able to recall. She apparently achieved reasonable success in communicating these ideas to her

students and thereby attaining her goals. Atkinson's students appeared to fare quite poorly by contrast. One might conclude that Atkinson's social studies or democratic citizenship goals took too much valuable time away from the content and storyline of the revolutionary period. Her students, therefore, had only a bare-bones sense of that history. Comparatively, Palmer's students benefited much more by the in-depth coverage of the period for its own sake. However, extenuating circumstances make this conclusion at least partially suspect.

Atkinson allowed only a short period of time (about 10 minutes) for her students to fill in the K-W-L forms, both before and after the unit. She had not used the forms before and saw the exercise as designed primarily to serve research interests and not her own goals specifically. Palmer, by contrast, had used the forms before in language arts, valued the data they generated, and insisted that her students take an extended period of time (45 minutes both before and after the unit) to fill them out. As a result, drawing conclusions based on the K-W-L data alone is problematic. Also, the K-W-Ls fail to provide much insight into the democratic citizenship dispositions that Atkinson stressed. Therefore, to augment the K-W-L data, we turn next to differences apparent in the student interviews.

Comparisons of Student Interview Responses

Table 4 (see Appendix E) places the responses of the six interviewees from each class side by side for comparative purposes. Questions are paired to reflect the pre-and post-interviewing procedure. I discuss, in order, general trends apparent in the Knowledge (questions 1-17 in the pre-unit interview and 4-20 in the post unit interview) and the Disposition (questions 17-24 in the pre-unit interview and 21-28 in the post) Sections. In between these two sections, I comparatively examine the results of the publisher-supplied test that both groups of students took at the conclusion of the American Revolution unit. This latter comparison augments conclusions reached concerning Knowledge Section interview responses.

1. Knowledge Section of the Interview Protocol. The Knowledge Section responses do not reveal the gap in students' knowledge that appears in the class comparisons on the K-W-L forms. Judging by the frequency of the "I don't know" response in the pre-unit interview, the two classes seemed evenly matched at the outset. Most of the six students in each class appeared uncertain about the American Revolution period in U.S. history. On almost every question in the Knowledge Section, a majority of the

12 students said they did not know or were unsure of an answer. Following probes which often represented rephrasings of the questions, many students in both classes attempted tentative guesses. Sometimes these guesses showed that students did possess some facts and details about the period, but as in the K-W-Ls, these details appeared mostly disconnected and sometimes distorted. Again, none of this should be surprising given that fifth grade serves as their first experience with chronological, narrative U.S. history.

Significant (and occasionally dramatic) changes occurred in students' thinking following the unit. As the post-question responses to Knowledge Section questions in Table 4 indicate, students in both classes came away from the unit with a much improved grasp of the events, people, terms, and possible causal connections of the period under study. Notable decreases in the "I don't know" response were observed. Most of the six students in each class recalled and frequently explained key ideas, terms, and causal relationships (e.g., the war had to do with British tax policy and the desire for colonial independence, the meaning of the phrase "no taxation without representation", the standard explanation of the Boston Tea Party, a sense of the purpose of the *Declaration of Independence*, etc.) that they had learned about the American Revolution.

The most notable differences in their recollections about the period related to the differential emphasis which Palmer and Atkinson had placed on various aspects of the American Revolution-Constitutional period. For example, Atkinson's students appeared better informed about the struggle and contention over the ratification of the *Constitution*, a topic she had stressed in the closing days of the unit (VanSledright, 1992c), and one that Palmer downplayed (VanSledright, 1992b) in favor of spending more time on the relevance of the *Bill of Rights* (see post-unit questions #17, #18, #20). Consistent with Palmer's focus on the importance of historical details, her six students had slightly better recall of the events that began the war (post-unit question #13), noting particularly that historians do not know who fired the first shot (none of Atkinson's students mentioned this). Palmer's students also related a slightly better grasp of key characters (male and female) during the period (post-unit questions #14, #15). This may be traceable to her use of historical fiction much of which focused on the stories of individual people who lived during the period (cf. VanSledright, 1992b for a list of references). Slight differences in the

degree of empathy students manifested also emerged (post-unit questions #8a, #11). More students (of the six) in Atkinson's class appeared to understand the Boston Tea Party from both a colonial and British perspective than did students from Palmer's class. Several of Palmer's students seemed to demonstrate a stronger colonial bias. A similar difference emerged in the post-unit question that dealt with how King George may have felt about the colonists (see post-question #11).[5] The slightly higher sense of empathy projected by Atkinson's students (although students from both classes clearly displayed it) could be attributable to her more explicit emphasis on differing points of view in history.

Overall, with the exception of the differences just noted, the responses of the 12 students to the post-unit Knowledge Section protocol were quite similar. This conclusion suggests several interpretations: (a) Each teacher, in her own fashion, succeeded fairly well in reaching her knowledge transmission goals, although in important ways these goals could be criticized for their colonial bias and standard, textbook orientation; (b) the differences in knowledge of the period suggested by the K-W-L forms can be seen as misleading if we assume that the responses of six students from each class are representative of the whole; and (c) the perceived pressure to cover the material influenced the teachers' mediation practices, but did so in way which preserved their ability to cover it in depth, which, in turn, may have worked to assist their students' ability to recall information about the period.

2. Comparative test results. Before turning to the Disposition section of the interview protocols, an examination of the outcomes on the publisher-supplied test which the students took at the end of the unit is in order. The results of this test bolster the conclusion that students' knowledge gain and recall ability were similarly enhanced by each teacher's treatment of the unit. Table 5 (see Appendix E) displays the comparative results on the multiple-choice sections of this test (complete-test numerical comparisons are not possible because of the differential way in which the essay responses were evaluated).

Multiple Choice Section A on the test measured factual recall of the historical record presented in Chapter 7 ("The Road To Independence") of the Silver Burdett and Ginn (Helmus et al., 1988) textbook, *The United States Yesterday and Today*. Section B consisted of five short-answer essay questions which

---

5A few students appear to contradict themselves on this question (Aimee, Janine, and Frederic). In general, changes or vacillations of opinion occurred as a consequence of further probing.

also directly addressed a student's ability to recall details presented in the chapter. Section C, also multiple-choice items, presented a paragraph taken directly from the text, then asked students to answer a series of questions based on that paragraph. This was essentially a reading comprehension exercise because the answers were (ostensibly) in the text itself.

As Table 5 indicates, the results of the test were almost identical: mean scores varied by only one percentage point. The high scores were the same (34 of 35), although Palmer had one more student who scored at this level than did Atkinson. The median score was exactly the same. Low scores were both below the 50% mark; however, Palmer's low scorer fell short by considerably more than did Atkinson's. Comparisons on the essay section of the test are difficult because the teachers used different "grading methods" to assess the quality of responses (see VanSledright, 1992b, 1992c). However, the essay questions did call for primarily factual answers. Examining student samples suggested that differences were minimal. Most of the students in each class did reasonably well on the questions that they answered (Atkinson's students had a choice about which questions they would answer). For both classes, those that did well on the multiple-choice sections also did well on the essays and vice versa. To the extent that these tests are valid and reliable measures of textbook knowledge, then comparative results provide more evidence for the conclusion that there were only slight knowledge differences between the two classes and that these were more closely related to the patterns of detail emphasized by each teacher than in the amount of knowledge learned.

3. Disposition Section of the Interview Protocol. In this section of the interview protocol, differences appeared in rather subtle forms. In general, while the differences were not great, the ones that do emerge seem to reflect the teachers' different orientations to the interaction between classroom goals, organizational style, and subject matter beliefs: Palmer's to the more controlling, autocratic side of the ledger, Atkinson's to the more democratic, participatory side. However, these approaches may well represent varying *ranges* of application (to dominate or share authority) rather than daily, well-marked consistencies extending across the unit and the school year.

Apparently, the exposure to democratic ideas and principles evinced in the study of the American Revolution-Constitutional period had only limited influence on students' thinking about these historic

notions. One reason for this was that students in both classes already had demonstrated general dispositions toward democratic principles in the pre-unit interview, where most of them indicated an interest in and value for negotiation, participation, and compromise (although, as pre-unit question #19 suggests, Atkinson's students may have had a deeper appreciation for their value). They also communicated that people have a right to express their opinions and that they were allowed to do this in class. They were also articulate in making suggestions about, and were amenable to pursuing, improvements in the quality of life in their communities and in the nation as a whole. They favored group work or work done in pairs over individually assigned classroom activities, suggesting a disposition toward shared, communal activities. Finally, on the whole, they demonstrated a positive regard for the process of democratic decision making indicated by their stress on the importance of voting.

These "predispositions" may have their roots in family attitudes and values, or may have something to do with the teachers' classroom practices that antedated this mid-year study. Along with these common dispositions, however, there were subtle differences between the two groups of students. These differences emerge in both the pre- and post-unit questions rather than in pre-post changes emerging from experiences specific to the unit.

Atkinson's students appeared slightly more influenced by democratic, participatory orientations and personal rights than did Palmer's. For example, both before and after the unit, Atkinson's six students emphasized that, with respect to classroom decisions, voting ought to be the method by which matters were resolved (although, when pressed with probes, three students did shift their positions somewhat; see pre-unit question #24 and post-unit question #27). Palmer's students tended to be more circumspect. Only three said initially that voting was the key, and after probing, two added that voting should follow a discussion. Barry and Frederic noted that "no key issue had come up" in Palmer's class that necessitated an important decision. In the post-unit interview (question #27), students were probed to find out to what extent voting procedures should, in their opinion, be applied. Two students (Elena, Robert) from Atkinson's class modified their earlier stress on voting by giving the teacher more authority over classroom decisions. By contrast, all six of Palmer's students noted Palmer's control over what they

learned, and two of them (Lorrie, Frederic) argued that students should *not* be allowed to choose what they learned.

Related differences, although even more subtle, can be observed in other responses. In pre-unit question #19, Frederic observes that Palmer "keeps arguments about U.S. history under control," and in post-unit question #23, Lara explains that in class it is OK to disagree with Palmer, but "if it comes up on a test, she's right." No one made quite these kind of observations about Atkinson (although several of her students did indicate the importance of history books, as opposed to their own opinions, as authoritative). These small differences in student responses may relate to the relative openness or closedness of the decision-making process in Palmer's and Atkinson's classrooms, a process more explicitly important to Atkinson than Palmer.

Those who have surveyed the political socialization literature (e.g., Angell, 1991; Ferguson, 1991) note how difficult it is to link democratic citizenship dispositions to particular teachers and classrooms. In general, consistent experiences across grades in classrooms, where authority over decisions is shared among participants, point to gains in the type of democratic dispositions valued by social studies curriculum theorists (e.g., Parker & Jarolimek, 1984). This appears to be a longitudinal and cumulative phenomenon. Studies have not had much success tracing gains to individual classrooms.[6] Even if Atkinson is a good example of a teacher with powerful and strongly articulated democratic classroom goals, her influences on students might easily be countered by more control-minded middle school teachers (particularly if Palonsky [1987] is correct about the public lobby, and if these teachers are the defensive type described by McNeil [1986] in her research). Furthermore, Atkinson's students may have been partly wary of her goals because, perhaps, they had not previously encountered an adult who seemed as ready as she did to share classroom control and solicit student participation. In this sense, her influence might also be muted. But these are speculative remarks. It is entirely possible that Atkinson's "democratic days" are evenly balanced with her "non-democratic days," making her, in a sense, more similar to Palmer than the teacher interview data would suggest.

---

[6]However, a very recent study by Avery and her colleagues (1992) does suggest that a specific curriculum aimed at generating gains in students' "political tolerance" may have positive results.

Finally, small differences emerged in the miscellaneous questions asked only in the post-unit interview (see post-unit questions #28 and #1-3 on Table 4). With regard to students' attitudes about the unit, a majority of students in both classes indicated that the unit stimulated their interests. However, what specific topics they chose varied relative to differences in instructional method. Four students in Atkinson's class noted the struggle over the *Constitution's* ratification as most interesting, while no one in Palmer's class made a similar observation. Several of Palmer's students chose instead the discussion of the amendments to the *Constitution* and the "taxes" simulation exercise as the most notable classroom activities.

Atkinson's students recalled that history involved learning about "mistakes" of the past, a comment not made by Palmer's students. Other than this difference, student definitions of history were quite similar (post-unit question #1). Both groups of students had some difficulty providing a rationale for why they learned history in school or on how it could help them in their lives away from school (questions #2 and #3). However, Atkinson's students were somewhat more articulate and quick to respond than were Palmer's (see question #2). Half of Palmer's students said at one point that they were not sure of a rationale. On post-unit question #3 concerning the value of history for life away from school, both groups of students tended to provide rather utilitarian responses. However, Robert from Atkinson's class did say that learning history can help you "avoid the mistakes of the past." In general, the responses to these several questions suggest that Atkinson's students had a broader sense of the value of learning history. This may be connected to Atkinson's emphasis on history as tool for solving problems and informing decisions. Palmer, by contrast, never offered this type of rationale to her students during the study.

Pedagogical Comparisons

To compare classroom activities and teaching practices, two sets of criteria are employed to aid with the interpretive analysis. The first set derives from the work of Reed (1989) and describes what she perceives to be a cluster of 10 outcomes that define "good history education" (see also Whelan, 1992, p. 7) The second comes from Newmann's (1990) work on what he terms "thoughtful social studies classrooms." These two sets of criteria were chosen because (a) they are pragmatically useful for making sense of classroom environments, (b) they appear to be readily adaptable, subject-matter (i.e. U.S.

history) specific, and germane to social studies teaching and learning. However, it must be noted that both of these criteria clusters were developed in connection with secondary teaching practices. Therefore, their use here may be somewhat limited by the nature of the fifth-grade classrooms to which they are applied.[7]

Reed's (1989) criteria for good history include (a) cultivating historical empathy, (b) developing an appreciation of cultural diversity and shared humanity, (c) engendering an understanding of the interplay of change and continuity in history, (d) establishing a grasp of the complexity of historical causation, (e) developing a respect for historical details, (f) creating a suspicion of abstract generalizations, (g) constructing an appreciation for the importance of the personal character of individuals as they influence human affairs, and developing the ability to recognize (h) the difference between fact and conjecture, (i) the difference between evidence and assertion, and (j) "useful" historical questions.

Both Palmer and Atkinson appear to fare reasonably well when assessed by these criteria. Classroom interactions and student interview data for both classes suggest that the teachers were able to help their students develop a degree of empathy for differing points of view as well as for the difficulties historical actors encountered during the American Revolution and the period in which the *Constitution* and *Bill of Rights* were debated. One could argue that Atkinson held an edge here (and perhaps her students also as a result of her influence) because of her stress on point of view, subtext (Wineburg, 1991), and, as a specific instance, the political machinations involved in ratifying the *Constitution*. Despite stipulating goals related to the importance of teaching about cultural diversity, neither teacher demonstrated much of this in the unit. This might be related to their perception that the unit's historical specificity (or at least what the textbook circumscribed) did not lend itself to a consideration of this issue. Atkinson did devote part of a lesson to a reading and discussion of the ethnic and ethical issues tied up in the story of a rabbi and synagogue vandals (VanSledright, 1992c). Palmer took no similar routes,

---

[7]It must also be said that the use of these criteria here is not an effort to validate the constructs advanced by these theorists. Their application in what follows could be considered as much a test of the constructs as a test of the students and their teachers. However, neither test was the intent; developing and using comparative devices to aid the interpretive process was.

although she suspended social studies one day in order to spend time with a current events newspaper. None of the topics discussed on that day dealt with issues or problems of cultural diversity.

As another possible result of Palmer's and Atkinson's curriculum mediation practices,[8] both groups of students showed some sense of the interplay of potential causative factors relevant to this period. However, the degree to which they understood the interplay of continuity and change in history is difficult to understand based on an analysis of only one unit. Respect for historical details and particularities and appreciation for the importance of the personal character of individuals as they influence human affairs, were evident in both student groups, but Palmer may have produced an advantage here if the K-W-L data are taken as strong evidence. Palmer's emphasis on an appreciation of facts, details and historical actors for their own sake may help account for this. The criteria that included creating a suspicion of abstract generalizations and developing the ability to recognize the difference between fact and conjecture and between evidence and assertion may have appeared to Atkinson and Palmer as beyond the scope of what their students could deal with in-depth in the unit. Neither teacher made a concerted effort to explore their importance systematically. However, in the first lesson of the unit, Atkinson did invoke questions about the nature of colonial propaganda in terms such as "the Boston Massacre" and the "Boston Tea Party" (VanSledright, 1992c), and Palmer, for example, tried to get Adam (and later other classmates) to support his opinion in the "advantages/disadvantages" exercise on taxation in lesson #4 (VanSledright, 1992b). Also, in interviews, some students remarked about the importance of possessing at least some textbook-based evidence when assertions were put forth. And, as another example, in the discussion of the *Bill of Rights* in Palmer's class, she made a point to request that her students support their assertions.

As far as the ability to frame useful questions is concerned, Atkinson could argue that she produced students who held the advantage here. In general, her students generated more questions and were more openly curious in class than were Palmer's, but this may be tied to differences in the way in which the teachers structured opportunities to ask questions rather than to the students themselves. A

---

[8]It is certainly possible that the students in both classes generated reciprocal influences on their teachers as well. In general, the reverse influences were difficult to read and interpret. This may relate, in part, to the disproportionate emphasis this study placed on how the teachers influenced their students.

second study of both groups of students in eighth-grade U.S. history might bear out the different influences of each teacher on questioning processes.

Newmann (1990) has also provided tools to examine classrooms with reference to what he calls "thoughtful social studies environments." Newmann assumes, based on his research, that thoughtfulness should be a hallmark of strong social studies teaching that emphasizes higher order thinking (which would include U.S. history). The most salient "thoughtful classroom" factors emerging from his research include (a) classroom discourse focuses in depth on relatively few topics as opposed to a shallow overview of many; (b) classroom interaction reflects continuity and coherence of ideas; (c) students are encouraged to think before responding to questions; (d) teachers ask students to clarify and justify their responses and assertions; (e) the teacher models thoughtfulness by articulating problem-solving processes and acknowledging the difficulties inherent in such processes; and (f) student discourse demonstrates the presence of novel ideas and understandings concerning the topics studied, rather than routine recall of more conventionally presented (e.g., textbook) notions.

Both Palmer and Atkinson focused their students' attention around key issues important to crucial events in the unit. Both teachers tried to tell a coherent story about struggle, difficulty, death, and triumph. These stories, for the most part, left out extraneous details and dealt with the issues in depth. Post-unit data from both classes suggest that the teachers influenced students' understanding of the crucial developments of this period, although the differences in what students recall appear connected to the differences in what the teachers stressed. Generally, more discussion of issues occurred in Atkinson's class than in Palmer's (in keeping with their stylistic differences). However, the power of discussion Palmer elicited from her students during the treatment of the *Bill of Rights* was seldom matched in Atkinson's room. Despite differences in the degree and amount of classroom discourse, both teachers tried to allow students time to think before answering questions. Atkinson seemed to have more difficulty with this than Palmer, perhaps because she perceived the press of time to be more intense (especially following her illness; see VanSledright, 1992c).

Much of the way in which Atkinson described her social studies goals turns on Newmann's (1990) fourth factor: the teacher asks students to clarify and justify their assertions. Classroom interactions across

the unit showed Atkinson asking students to support their points of view with "evidence" from previous lessons and the textbook. In the post-unit interviews, several of Atkinson's students noted that, when arguments over issues occurred, one could use the teacher, historians, and textbook to "back up your opinion." Palmer also stressed the same need for clarification and justification. However, her organizational style and the way she designed lessons gave students some, but generally fewer, discursive opportunities in which to do so (see VanSledright, 1992b).

Both teachers modeled the problem-solving process and showed interest in students' ideas and suggestions. Both also indicated that problem solving and decision making were difficult, uncertain practices. Palmer's wavering responses with regard to capital punishment probably signaled to students how difficult certain choices were. It provided a good example of her more subtle, less explicit, form. For her part, Atkinson tended to throw decisions into the air rather frequently. Her questioning style may have suggested to students that few matters ought to be taken on authority or faith alone and that the source of "solutions" needed to be worked out by students themselves. Again, the differences between the teachers involved a matter of degree and range of application: Palmer tended to be more controlling, orderly, and cautious; Atkinson more aggressive, contentious, and incisive. These characteristics, in turn, were interactively tied to each teacher's goals and mediation practices.

If the unit lessons are taken as a whole, the evidence suggests that Atkinson's students generated more novel questions, ideas, and understandings than did Palmer's. Again, this may reflect differences in style and likely in goals. It might be more reasonable to say that Atkinson's students generated more unsolicited, novel ideas because Atkinson encouraged and, to a degree, sanctioned them.[9] Palmer's students were also creative (e.g., their responses to the "letter" assignment), but usually within the parameters of specified assignments and learning activities. The discussion of the *Bill of Rights* was an exception.

---

[9]One might argue that Atkinson's students produced "novel questions and ideas" to a fault, especially during a substitute's tenure in her classroom (see Atkinson's case study for details). From this, one might conclude that Atkinson's style and goals traversed a tenuous path separating discursive creativity from classroom chaos. If this observation has value, it might help us to understand why some teachers, perhaps Palmer, opt for a more controlled atmosphere, one farther from the tenuous path.

Generally speaking, Atkinson's classroom appeared to be a slightly more "thoughtful environment" than Palmer's based on Newmann's (1990) six attributes. However, this again remains a matter of range and degree based on the interaction between goals and organizational style. As one might expect given the goal and curriculum gatekeeping differences that distinguish these teachers, one fares slightly better with regard to Reed's (1989) criteria for good history teaching (Palmer), while the other succeeds at generating a generally more thoughtful classroom atmosphere. Such differences go to the heart of the curriculum debates in social studies education by pointing to the trade-offs that occur when one chooses to foreground certain goals, and the practices they imply, as opposed to others. The nature of these trade-offs relative to the debates are considered next.

Discussion of Trade-offs and Curriculum Debates

These two cases bear on the kinds of approaches, orientations, and typologies suggested by Barr et al. (1977), Martorella (1985), and others (Evans 1989; Goodman & Adler, 1985). Although Palmer and Atkinson each manifest characteristics of particular orientations delineated by these theorists, both teachers appear considerably more eclectic (one might say pragmatic) in their educational practices than representative of any particular approach or type. This suggests that the constructs of these theorists may have only limited value for researchers interested in classroom curriculum mediation practices. Focusing on research literature "approaches," "traditions," or "typologies" may cause researchers and other theorists to ignore what teachers actually do.

If these two teachers are any indication, the constructs also have limited descriptive power. As shorthand for describing teachers and curriculum mediation practices, they belie the complexities of the daily decisions that teachers make. In particular, they make the recurring dilemmas which teachers such as Atkinson and Palmer face appear more as solvable problems, that is, for example, by adjusting one's orientation to another "tradition." It may turn out that the value of these constructs relates more to descriptions of secondary teachers, however; additional comparative case studies would be helpful here as well. Nevertheless, findings in this study suggest that caution should be exercised when using the concepts to generalize about the orientations of social studies classroom teachers as a whole. I would argue that the contextual descriptions that follow provide more useful images of social studies teaching

and curriculum mediation practices than the orientations and approaches previously advanced in the literature.

In Wineburg and Wilson's (1988, 1991) case studies of two high school history teachers, they used the metaphor "peering at history through different lenses" to describe the differences they observed. The same metaphor may apply to Palmer and Atkinson (although in a different fashion than it was used in the Wineburg and Wilson study). Palmer tends to peer at U.S. history (the American Revolution period in particular) as important for its own sake (Howard & Mendenhall, 1982). Atkinson peers at it more from a social studies perspective, a position which foregrounds gatekeeping practices that call for it to be used as a tool to reflect on recurring social problems and issues (Engle & Ochoa, 1988; Hunt & Metcalf, 1968).

Within the context of this unit, and from the perspective of what students learned and were able to recall about the American Revolution period, the trade-offs inherent in peering at history from one lens as opposed to the other appear rather nominal. If care is taken to focus in depth on key historical issues in the unit and not get mired in the morass of facts, if efforts are made to make the subject matter meaningful, interesting and relevant to students, and if the content has coherence as in a well-crafted story, then students benefit considerably. The post-unit data suggest that both teachers were reasonably successful in accomplishing this much with their students. Therefore, one might conclude that Atkinson's efforts at expanding her goals beyond the value of historical knowledge for its own sake present students with additional learning opportunities to which Palmer's students had somewhat limited access.

Although the data concerning democratic, participatory citizenship dispositions demonstrate only subtle differences among students, there remains some reason to suggest that Atkinson exposed her students to more opportunities to explicitly question and evaluate a segment of U.S. history from the perspective of their own lives and their place in time. Such opportunities seem to have rich and perhaps longitudinal learning potentialities. In this sense, the trade-offs implied by this study may favor the type of history teaching employed by Atkinson. To put this point another way, despite the difference in lenses, both teachers were reasonably successful at reaching their "understanding the American Revolution"

goals,[10] and Atkinson appears to augment this success by providing some additional learning opportunities for her students.

The trade-offs for the teachers themselves appear more pronounced. To pursue goals that involve students in some of the deliberations and decisions necessary to run a classroom requires giving up a measure of control. This has potentially problematic consequences for teachers. It may well fly in the face of Palonsky's (1987) "public lobby' and bring recriminations from certain community members. Atkinson's decisions to follow her authority-questioning practices and to model these for her students may have made her life more complicated and troublesome than it would have been if she had operated her classroom more the way Palmer did. This is an important point. Theorists that propound the wisdom of teaching from a social studies perspective, namely, foregrounding controversial issues, problems, problem-solving and decision-making practices (cf. Engle & Ochoa, 1988; Oliver & Shaver, 1966/1974; Parker & Jarolimek, 1984) often pay scant attention to the psychic costs involved for teachers who attempt to adopt such an approach (Leming, 1989; Marker & Mehlinger, 1992). Palonsky (1987) notes:

> New teachers report the practical necessity of abandoning notions of academic freedom in order to survive in classrooms that they recognize as less open to new ideas than the universities in which they were trained. (p. 500)

By foregrounding her understanding of the subject matter of history, Palmer could use the implicit order (coherence, sequence, organization) she believed it provided to organize instruction, thereby avoiding some of the potential psychic difficulties and organizational dilemmas Atkinson's practices entailed.

The nature of classroom discourse becomes a site around which organizational dilemmas and the psychic costs they present to teachers are most notably felt. Cazden (1988) has remarked that

> in classrooms one person, the teacher, is responsible for controlling all the talk that occurs while the class is officially in session--controlling not just negatively, as a traffic policeman does to avoid collisions, but also positively, to enhance the purposes of education. (pp. 2-3)

To foreground goals that involve questioning and arguing about historical issues, "mistakes," and knowledge claims, as Atkinson did is to make this control Cazden speaks of even more problematic. If

---

[10]However, some scholars and revisionist historians would argue that both teachers' versions of the unit stayed insufficiently critical and communicated a relatively passive acceptance of "textbook" knowledge. This criticism may have merit. Both teachers, to different degrees, did define their role as knowledge transmitters in a tradition circumscribed by the value of school's socialization function.

some form of content coverage is also expected, this further adds layers of complexity. Time remains crucial. How to manage it as one's goals expand across, not only the historical knowledge terrain, but also on to the broader landscape of various social studies purposes, becomes of primary concern. From this perspective, Palmer's curriculum mediation practices (e.g. to control and limit student discourse) seemed to reduce decision-making complexities more so than did Atkinson's. From another perspective, Palmer's practices appeared to reduce several opportunities to enhance educational purposes, ones that Atkinson strove, but not without cost, to attain. Social studies curriculum theorists would do well to acknowledge and understand this type of trade-off embedded in their recommendations.[11]

Conclusion

Curriculum debates will continue to turn primarily on valuative, ethical, and aesthetic questions. The cases studies reported here provide empirical grist for those debates. One might think of these cases as two examples of variations in fifth-grade social studies-history classroom communities complete with readings of subject matter, goals, definitions, and influences. They speak to the question: What kind of social studies/history classroom communities do we want, and what are some ways to achieve them?

These two case studies do not answer this question in any definitive way. However, they do offer evidence that the curriculum mediation choices teachers make will influence what students learn, how they read themselves into what they are learning, and where this learning may potentially lead. Palmer's choice comes with certain practices that may limit the range of her students' learning opportunities while making her and their lives more structured, orderly, and less problematic. Atkinson's choice may create additional learning opportunities, but possibly at the expense of exacerbating classroom control and content coverage dilemmas. It seems difficult to imagine how these trade-offs could be avoided given the teaching context these teachers experienced.

---

[11]Some theorists have. See particularly Mehlinger (1981), Leming (1992), and Shaver(1987).

References

Angell, A.V. (1991). Democratic climates in elementary school classrooms: A review of theory and research. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 19*, 241-266.

Anyon, J. (1981). Elementary schooling and distinctions of social class. *Interchange, 12*, 118-132.

Armento, B. (1986). Research on teaching social studies. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed., pp. 942-951). New York: Macmillan.

Avery, P.G., Bird, K., Johnstone, S., Sullivan, J.L., & Thalhammer, K. (1992, April). *Do all the people have all of the rights all of the time? Exploring political tolerance with adolescents.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Barber, B. (1989). Public talk and civic action: Education for participation in a strong democracy. *Social Education, 53*, 355-356; 370.

Barr, R., Barth, J., & Shermis, S. (1977). *Defining the social studies.* Washington, DC: National Council for Social Studies.

Beard, C.A. (1934). *The nature of the social sciences in relation to the objectives of instruction.* New York: Scribner's.

Boyd, W.L. (1979). The changing politics of curriculum policy making for American schools. In J. Schaffarzick & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Value conflicts and curriculum issues: Lessons from research and experience* (pp. 73-137). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Bradley Commission on History in the Schools. (1989). *Building a history curriculum: Guidelines for teaching history in schools.* Washington, DC: Educational Excellence Network.

Brophy, J. (1990). Teaching social studies for understanding and higher-order applications. *Elementary School Journal, 90*, 351-417.

Brophy, J., & VanSledright, B.A. (1990). *Structured teacher interview.* Unpublished interview protocol.

Butt, R., Raymond, D., & Yamagishi, L. (1988). Autobiographical praxis: Studying the formation of teachers' knowledge. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 7*, 87-164.

Cazden, C.B. (1988). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Connelly, F.M., & Clandinin, D.J. (1990). Stories of experience and narrative inquiry. *Educational Researcher, 19*, 2-14.

Downey, M.T., & Levstik, L.S. (1991). Teaching and learning history. In J. Shaver (Ed.), *Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning* (pp. 400-410). New York: Macmillan.

Downey, M.T., & Levstik, L.S. (1988). Teaching and learning history: The research base. *Social Education, 52*, 336-342.

Engle, S., & Ochoa, A. (1988). *Education for democratic citizenship: Decision making in the social studies.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Evans, R.W. (1989). Teacher conceptions of history. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 17*, 210-240.

Ferguson, P. (1991). Impacts on social and political participation. In J. Shaver (Ed.), *Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning* (pp. 385-399). New York: Macmillan.

Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1975). *The discovery of grounded theory*. Chicago: Aldine.

Goetz, J., & LeCompte, M. (1981). Ethnographic research and the problem of data reduction. *Anthropology of Education Quarterly, 12*, 51-70.

Goodman, J., & Adler, S. (1985). Becoming an elementary social studies teacher: A study of perspectives. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 13*, 1-20.

Grant, S.G., & VanSledright, B.A. (1991). From citizen knowledge to civic virtue: The paradoxical journey from here to there. *Social Science Record, 28*, 23-34.

Guba, E.G., & Lincoln, Y.S. (1981). *Effective evaluation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gutmann, A. (1987). *Democratic education*. Princton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Helmus, T., Toppin, E., Pounds, N., & Arnsdorf, V. (1988). *The United States yesterday and today*. Morristown, NJ: Silver Burdett & Ginn.

Howard, J., & Mendenhall, T. (1982). *Making history come alive: The place of history in schools*. Washington, DC: Report of the History Commission of the Council for Basic Education.

Hunt, M., & Metcalf, L.E. (1968). *Teaching high school social studies* (2nd ed.). New York: Harper.

Jenness, D. (1990). *Making sense of social studies*. New York: Macmillan.

Leming, J. (1992). Ideological perspectives within the social studies profession: An empirical examination of the two cultures thesis. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 20*, 293-312.

Leming, J. (1989). The two cultures of social studies education. *Social Education, 53*, 404-408.

Marker, G., & Mehlinger, H. (1992). Social studies. In P. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum* (pp. 830-851). New York: Macmillan.

Marsh, C. (1987). Implementation of a social studies curriculum in an Australian elementary school. *Elementary School Journal, 87*, 475-486.

Martorella, P. (1985). *Elementary social studies: Developing reflective, competent, and concerned citizens*. Boston: Little, Brown.

McKeown, M.G., & Beck, I.L. (1990). The assessment and characterization of young learners' knowledge of a topic in history. *American Educational Research Journal, 27*, 688-726.

McNeil, L. (1986). *Contradictions of control: School structure and school knowledge*. New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Mehlinger, H. (1981). Social studies: Some gulfs and priorities. In H. Mehlinger & O.L. Davis, Jr. (Eds.), *The social studies* (80th yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, pp. 244-270) Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Newmann, F. (1990). Higher order thinking in teaching social studies: A rationale for assessment of classroom thoughtfulness. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 22*, 41-56.

Ogle, D. (1986). K-W-L: A teaching model that develops active reading of expository text. *Reading Teacher, 39*, 564-570.

Oliver, D.W., & Shaver, J.S. (1966/1974). *Teaching public issues in the high school.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin

Palonsky, S.B. (1987). Political socialization in elementary schools. *Elementary School Journal, 87*, 493-505.

Parker, W., & Jarolimek, J. (1984). *Citizenship and the critical role of the social studies.* Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.

Ravitch, D. (1987). Tot sociology, or what happened to history in the grade schools? *American Scholar, 56*, 343-353.

Reed, E. (1989). Historical literacy: The case for history in American education. In P. Gagnon (Ed.), *The Bradley Commission on History in Schools* (pp. 68-81). New York: Macmillan.

Shaver, J. (1981). Citizenship, values, and morality in social studies. In H. Melinger & O.L. Davis (Eds.), *The social studies* (80th yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, pp.105-125). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Shaver, J. (1987). Implications from research: What should be taught in social studies. In V. Richardson-Koehler (Ed.), *Educators' handbook: A research perspective* (pp. 112-138). New York: Longman.

Stodolsky, S. (1988). *The subject matters: Classroom activity in math and social studies.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Thornton, S. (1991). Teacher as curricular-instructional gatekeeper in social studies. In J. Shaver (Ed.), *Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning* (pp. 237-248). New York: Macmillan.

Thornton, S., & McCourt-Lewis, A.(1990, November). *A question in search of an answer:What do elementary children learn from studying the American Revolution?* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies, College and University Faculty Assembly Symposium, Anaheim, California.

VanSledright, B.A. (1992a). *Stories of the American Revolution period: Comparative case studies of two fifth-grade teachers' curriculum mediation practices.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University.

VanSledright, B.A. (1992b). *Teaching about the American Revolution: The case of Ramona Palmer* (Elementary Subjects Center Series No. 68). East Lansing: Michigan State University, Institute for Research on Teaching. Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects.

VanSledright, B.A. (1992c). *Teaching about the American Revolution: The case of Sara Atkinson* (Elementary Subjects Center Series No. 69). East Lansing: Michigan State University, Institute for Research on Teaching. Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects.

Whelan, M. (1992). History and the social studies: A response to the critics. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 20*, 2-16.

White, C.S. (1982). A validation study of Barth-Shermis Social Studies Preference Scale. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 10*, 1-20.

White, J. J. (1985). What works for teachers: A review of ethnographic research studies as they inform issues of social studies curriculum and instruction. In W. Stanley (Ed.), *Review of research in social studies education, 1976-1983* (pp. 121-137). Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.

Wineburg, S.S. (1991). On the reading of historical texts: Notes on the breach between school and academy. *American Educational Research Journal, 28*, 495-519.

Wineburg, S.S., & Wilson, S.M. (1988). Models of wisdom in the teaching of history. *Phi Delta Kappan, 70*, 50-58.

Wineburg, S.S., & Wilson, S.M. (1991). Subject matter knowledge in the teaching of history. In J. Brophy (Ed.), *Advances in research on teaching* (pp.305-347). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Appendices

Appendix A

Structured Teacher Interview*

This interview is designed to help me understand what you do and why you do it when you teach social studies. The questions are arranged to progress from general background and philosophy through your approach or orientation to social studies to questions about the American Revolution unit, and then on to some particular issues.

It may be helpful to clarify some terms that will be used frequently: goals, content, teaching method or approach, and assessment or evaluation. Goals refer to the student characteristics or outcomes (knowledge, skills, values or attitudes, dispositions to action) that you seek to develop through your teaching. Content refers to what is taught. Instructional method or approach refer to how the content is taught--the ways that the students get information, the kinds of teacher-student discourse that occur, and the kinds of activities and assignments that are used. Assessment or evaluation refer to your attempts to measure the levels of success achieved--what you attempt to assess and what methods you use to do so. This includes both assessment of the progress of the class as a group (i.e., assessment of the degree to which you have been successful in accomplishing your goals as the teacher) and assessment of the accomplishments of individual students (as a basis for grading and perhaps also for instructional decisions).

In answering the questions, please note whether or not your views on the issues have changed over time. If they have, please tell how and why.

Your Background and Philosophy

1. Formal education.
   a. Bachelor level (major, minor)
   b. Master's or other advanced degrees

2. Significant non-degree educational experiences that have affected your approach to teaching (independent reading, inservice activities, professional organizations, etc.)

3. Years of experience at various grade levels.

4. How has your background influenced your understanding and approach to teaching social studies? Give examples where appropriate.

5. How did you happen to develop your special interest in social studies?

Philosophy and Approach to Teaching

6. What is the role of elementary-level (K-6) education? What should it accomplish with students?

---

* Adapted from "Teacher Interview Questions" protocol (Brophy and VanSledright, 1990).

7. What are the key features of your role as a teacher at your grade level (in general, not just in social studies)?

8. Describe your approach to teaching (in general, not just in social studies). What themes, theories, or descriptive labels will help me to understand how you approach your teaching and how you differ from other teachers?

9. Is there anything else that should be noted about your general background and philosophy of teaching?

Your Approach to Teaching Social Studies

Goals

1. How do you think about social studies as a school subject? (What is it, why is it taught, what are its main purposes and goals at the K-6 level?)

2. What are your main goals for students in teaching social studies?

3. Other than the particular knowledge content covered in each of your units, are there more general knowledge goals that you address in your social studies teaching across the school year? If so, what are these knowledge goals and how do you address them?

4. Are there general skills goals that you address in teaching social studies across the school year? If so, how do you address them?

5. Are there general value or attitudinal goals that you address in teaching social studies across the school year? If so, how do you address them?

6. Are there general citizen action goals or other goals that involve building dispositions (i.e., dispositions to take action in certain situations) that you address in teaching social studies across the school year? If so, how do you address them?

7. Have you seen statements about social studies purposes and goals or suggested curriculum guidelines that have been published by the National Council for the Social Studies or other social studies organizations? If so, what do you know about them? Do they affect your teaching?

8. Have you seen goals statements or curricular guidelines published by the state of Michigan? If so, what do you know about them? Do they affect your teaching?

9. Does your district have social studies goals or curriculum guidelines? If so, what do you know about them? Do they affect your teaching?

10. Does your school have social studies goals or curriculum guidelines in addition to those of the district? If so, what do you know about them? Do they affect your teaching?

11. Do you know anything about the philosophy that went into the development of the social studies series that you use, such as the authors' thinking about the purposes and goals of social studies? If so, has this knowledge

affected your teaching in any way?

12. Are you aware of contrasting views about the nature and purposes of social studies or how social studies should be taught? How would you describe yourself as a social studies teacher or contrast yourself with teachers who take different approaches?

Content Selection

13. Time for social studies teaching is limited, so that you cannot both address all of the many topics that may be worthy of consideration and also address each topic in sufficient depth to develop good understanding. How do you manage this breadth v. depth dilemma?

14. What criteria do you use in deciding what social studies content to include or emphasize and what content to omit or de-emphasize?

15. Do you include certain content because of external pressure rather than because you think the content is important? (i.e., pressures from state or district policies, testing programs, parents, etc.) Do you exclude certain content because of such external pressures?

Content Organization and Sequencing

16. What is the basis for the organization and sequencing of the social studies content that you will address during the year?

17. In addition to the structure of content within units , is there any spiraling or other organization of content that involves sequences or linkages across units?

Content Representation

18. What sources of content do you use to provide input to students (your own explaining or story telling, a textbook, other print sources, films or other media, direct experience with artifacts or other objects of study, etc.)?

19. What principles do you follow when presenting content to students via explaining or story telling? Do you do anything to focus the students' attention on key ideas or to help them organize the material around these key ideas?

20. What sorts of props (photos, maps, diagrams, material on the overhead projector, artifacts, etc.) do you use to illustrate or provide examples of what you are explaining?

21. Do you ask questions before, during, or after your presentations? If so, what kinds of questions, and for what purposes?

22. Do you teach skills as well as knowledge in social studies? If so, do you teach some of these skills directly rather than just provide opportunities for their development through work on activities and assignments? If you do teach certain skills directly, which skills are they?

Teacher-Student Discourse

23. What forms of teacher-student discourse are emphasized during whole-class lessons and activities (e.g., recitation of facts and definitions; checking for understanding; discussion or debate of alternative explanations, predictions, or policy positions; brainstorming solutions to problems or issues; discussion of linkages of content to the students' lives outside of school)? Do certain of these forms of discourse appear mostly in particular types of lessons? Are there changes in the kinds of discourse that occur as you work through a unit or through the school year?

24. Do students sometimes interact with peers in pairs or small groups to engage in cooperative learning activities or in discussions, debates, or other activities that feature student-student discourse? Explain.

Activities and Assignments

25. What purposes or roles do activities and assignments play in your social studies teaching? What kinds of activities and assignments are included, and why?

26. What principles or criteria do you use to decide on what activities or assignments to include? What makes good activities better than the alternatives?

27. Are there particular processes (artistic construction, discussion, debate, writing, research, simulation, etc.) that you include frequently in your activities and assignments because you think that they are especially valuable for promoting learning? Explain.

28. Do you try to integrate social studies with other subjects? If so, how does this influence your activity or assignment choices? What advantages and disadvantages does such integration entail?

Assessment and Evaluation

29. Do you assess students' entry level of knowledge about unit topics as you begin units? If so, how do you make such assessments and how do you use the information in teaching the units? Explain.

30. Do you assess progress during units? If so, how? Do you adjust your teaching in response to the assessment information? Explain.

31. At the end of a unit, how do you assess the extent to which you have accomplished your unit goals with the class as a whole? Why do you prefer this method to other methods?

32. How do you assess the performance of individual students to provide a basis for accountability and grading? Why do you prefer this approach to alternatives?

33. Do you try to assess progress toward general goals that cut across units? If so, give examples of such goals and how you assess such progress.

34. What would your students tell me if I asked them in June what were the most important things they learned in social studies this year?

Understanding, Critical Thinking, and Decision Making

Writings about social studies teaching often stress that students should understand what they are learning (i.e., not just memorize it without understanding it), should think critically about it, and should apply it in decision-making contexts.

35. What does it mean to you to say that students understand something? Do you try to teach for understanding in social studies? If so, what aspects of your approach are included with this goal in mind?

36. What does it mean for students to think critically about what they are learning? Does your approach include features designed to teach students how to think critically about what they are learning or to provide them with opportunities for doing so? Explain.

37. Does your approach include features designed to teach students how to make decisions or to provide them with opportunities for doing so? Explain.

Analysis of the American Revolution Unit

1. What are your main goals in teaching this unit? What knowledge, skills, values/attitudes, or dispositions do you want the students to acquire as a result of it?

2. Is the unit built around certain content and key ideas? If so, what are these?

3. How have you selected and organized this content? Explain specifically how it has been organized and why?

4. How do you represent this content to students? What different methods or approaches do you use?

5. What role does teacher-student discourse play in this unit?

6. What do the students usually know about the unit's content even before you begin to teach it? Do the students usually have some accurate prior knowledge of key ideas or other topics in the unit that you can build on? If so, give examples and tell how you build on this knowledge.

7. Are there some key ideas or topics about which the students usually have little or no prior knowledge, so that you have to help them develop an initial idea? If so, give examples and explain how you help them to develop initial ideas.

8. Are there key ideas or other topics about which students are likely to have naive conceptions or other prior "knowledge" that is distorted or

incorrect? If so, give examples and explain how you attempt to address and correct these misconceptions.

9. Are there any noteworthy activities or assignments included in this unit?

10. What role do critical thinking and decision making play in this unit? Examples of such student activities?

11. How is this unit similar to or different from other units taught in fifth-grade social studies? Do you teach this unit differently in particular ways? If so, what are they? Does your philosophy or approach change from unit to unit, and if so, how?

Miscellaneous Questions

1. How do you respond to individual differences in student knowledge or ability? Do you expose different students to different content, activities, or assignments? Do you use different methods of assessment or different grading standards for the most v. the least able students?

2. How do you try to make the social studies content meaningful and interesting to students?

3. Do your students ever ask why they need to know some of the things being taught in social studies? If so, what do you tell them? Give specific examples.

4. Can you relate examples of times when you found out that something wasn't working in your social studies teaching? In each example, what made you decide that change was needed and what did you do?

5. Most students in the primary grades cannot read and study efficiently enough to acquire significant information through reading. This is true of some students in later grades as well. If you cannot rely on independent study as a major source of preparation for all or some of your students, how do you compensate? How do you see that nonreaders get sufficient social studies information?

6. Students often lack experience with or even background information about many topics covered in elementary social studies, so that one often must plan in terms of developing an initial idea about the topic rather than in terms of cuing relevant background knowledge that will be extended or applied. Is this a significant problem at your grade level? Can you give examples of where you encounter it and how you respond to it?

7. To what extent do your students need physical examples, photos, or other concrete representations of things that lie outside their experiences to date? Give examples of social studies content taught at your grade level that students are not likely to understand unless they are exposed to such concrete examples.

8. Certain concepts and generalizations are too abstract for students at particular ages to understand in any complete or integrated way, although they may be able to understand certain simplified forms or examples

meaningfully. Are there social studies concepts or generalizations taught at your grade level that most of your students can grasp only partially if at all? If so, explain examples of this problem and what you try to do about it.

9. It often is argued that children's interests should be taken into account in selecting topics, examples, and activities. Have you tried to do this in developing your social studies curriculum? If so, give examples.

10. It often is argued that children (especially in the primary grades) need to represent their learning through multiple modalities (not just talk about it) if they are to develop complete understanding. Consequently, teachers' manuals often call for having students draw or paint, construct murals or displays, engage in pantomime or role play, stage dramas or pageants, and so on. Do you believe that such artistic, dramatic, or multisensory learning activities are <u>essential</u> to a good social studies curriculum? If not essential, are they <u>desirable</u>? Is there anything important that they bring to the program that wouldn't be brought through more typical activities and assignments built around content-based discourse (recitation, debate, discussion) or writing assignments (worksheets, research reports, critical analysis and synthesis)?

11. Some argue that elementary students should be shielded from unpleasant realities, so that elementary social studies curricula should avoid content that is controversial or that might be upsetting to students. Others view this an unnecessary overprotectiveness and argue that social studies content should portray the social world as it is, without avoiding or sanitizing its unpleasant aspects. What do you believe? Why? How does this affect your teaching?

12. Opinions vary on what sources of input are most suitable for elementary social studies. Some prefer to stick with textbooks and other nonfictional sources of information that provide mostly impersonal accounts of general concepts or ideas. Others would retain the factual emphasis but communicate as much as possible in story form, emphasizing personalized accounts of actual people or events that exemplify the general concepts or ideas. Still others would extend this to include children's literature, emphasizing factually based but nevertheless fictional stories. Finally, some would include myths, fables, folklore, and other purely fictional sources. Where do you stand on these issues of impersonal text v. personalized stories and purely factual v. partially or wholly fictional sources of social studies input? Why?

13. Elementary social studies series typically follow the <u>expanding communities</u> organizational framework. Many are satisfied with this framework, but many others would like to get rid of it. What do you know about this controversy? More generally, what are your views on the pros and cons of the expanding communities framework?

14. Social studies textbooks grades 4-6 are commonly criticized as being parade-of-facts compendia that address too much breadth (they cover too many topics) in not enough depth (they fail to develop important topics in sufficient depth to promote understanding). Do you agree with this assessment? If so, how would you change these texts? What would you

retain and emphasize, and what would you delete?

15. Some argue that elementary social studies teaching should emphasize an inquiry approach in which students learn to develop information in much the same ways that social scientists do. Others argue that this is premature for elementary students, and that elementary social studies should emphasize basic social knowledge and skills needed for understanding and functioning in everyday life. What do you believe? Why? How does this affect your teaching?

16. What about the values aspects of social studies teaching? Some argue that certain values are basic and universal, so that they should be inculcated in students systematically. Others argue that students should learn to think critically about the values aspects of issues, but should be allowed to determine for themselves what values they should embrace. What do you believe? Why? How does this affect your teaching?

17. Some argue that across-subjects integration should be emphasized because it makes for more natural, holistic learning. Others argue that much of what is done in the name of integration has only trivial value for teaching one or more of the school subjects involved, and they fear that too much emphasis on integration will damage the coherence and thrust of the curricula in the various subjects. What do you believe about across-subjects integration? Why? How does this affect your teaching?

18. Some believe that elementary students at particular ages and grade levels are pretty much the same as they always were. Others believe that social mobility, television, and other aspects of modern society are producing children who are different in many ways from the children of the past, so that a different kind of elementary social education is needed for them. What do you think about this? How do today's kids differ from those of 10, 20, or 30 plus years ago, and what does this imply about elementary social studies?

19. Some argue that elementary social studies should be mostly history (and to a lesser extent, geography and civics), much as it was before we began including so much content drawn from the social sciences (sociology, economics, anthropology, psychology). Others believe that this social science content is just as important and appropriate for elementary students as the history, geography, and civics content is, so they would like to retain the approximate balance that exists at the moment. What do you think? Should we keep the content balance roughly as it is? Should we reduce the social science content in order to teach more history? Or what?

20. Is there anything else that should be noted about how elementary social education could be improved?

Appendix B

K - W - L SHEET

The American Revolution

Question 1: What do I know about the American Revolution?

Question 2: What do I want to know about the American Revolution?

Question 3: What have I learned about the American Revolution?

Appendix C

Pre-Unit Student Interview Protocol
The American Revolution

1. The original 13 colonies in North America were settled mostly by English people and were ruled by England. But later they became an independent country--the United States. How did that happen?

2. For a long time, the colonists were happy to think of themselves as English and to be ruled by the English king. However, later they changed their minds. Why?

3. What were some of the problems caused by the French and Indian War?

4. The colonists' slogan was "No taxation without representation." What does that mean? (Probe extensively).

5. What was the Boston Tea Party? (If the student knows, ask: "Why did they dump the tea into the ocean instead of just taking it home with them?"). Do you think it was a good idea to do this?

6. What was the Declaration of Independence?

7. What was in the Declaration of Independence--what did it say?

8. The colonists wanted to break away from England because they thought that the king was treating them unfairly. What do you think the English King George thought about the colonists?

9. Did all of the colonists want to break away from England, or just some of them, or what? (If student says just some of them, ask: "Well, if people disagreed about what to do, then what happened?")

10. Eventually, the Revolutionary War started and fighting broke out between English soldiers and American patriots. Do you know what happened and why?

11. Who were some of the leaders of the American Revolution? (Probe for specifics on at least two)

12. Who were some of the women who participated in the Revolution? (Again, probe for specifics on at least two)

13. What happened after the war was over?

14. After the Revolutionary War, the 13 colonies had become the United States. The land and the people were still the same, so what had changed? How were the 13 United States different from the 13 colonies? (Probe for specifics).

Conditional follow ups (if student does not answer #14 fully):

14a. Who was the person (or persons) in charge of the colonies before the revolution? (If student says the governor, ask who was in charge of the governor).

14b. After the revolution the colonies became the United States. Who was the person(s) in charge of them then? How did this person(s) get to be in charge?

15. How did the people form a government for their new country called the United States? What did they do?

16. Have you ever heard of the Articles of Confederation? If so, tell me what you know about them. (Probe extensively)

17. What is the Constitution of the United States? Tell what you know about it. (Probe extensively: Who wrote it, Why was it written, What is in it, etc.)

18. If there was an argument at recess between some of the kids in this class and some other fifth-graders about who was going to use the tennis courts, how do you think it should be handled? (Probe, ask for the "why" and where they learned about it)

19. What happens if you have a different idea about what happened in American history than other kids in class? (Probe)

20. What happens if your idea about American history is different than Ms. Teacher's? What happens then? (Probe)

21. If you got involved in making this neighborhood or community a better place than it is now, what would you do? (Probe)

22. If you got involved in making this country a better place than it is now, what would you do? (Probe)

23. When you do assignments for class and to hand in to your teacher, which do you prefer--to work alone, with a partner, or in groups? (Probe)

24. How do you think important decisions should be made here in this class? (Probe) How about at home? (Probe)

25. What do you think about this interview? Why do you think I'm asking you all these questions?

Appendix D

Post-Unit Student Interview Protocol
The American Revolution

1. What do you think history is? (Probe extensively)

2. Why do you think they teach you history in school? (Probe extensively)

3. How might learning history help you in your life away from school? (Probe)

4. The original 13 colonies in North America were settled mostly by English people and were ruled by England. But later they became an independent country--the United States. How did that happen?

5. For a long time, the colonists were happy to think of themselves as English and to be ruled by the English king. However, later they changed their minds. Why?

6. What were some of the problems caused by the French and Indian War?

7. The colonists' slogan was "No taxation without representation." What does that mean? (Probe extensively).

8. What was the Boston Tea Party? (If the student knows, ask: "Why did they dump the tea into the ocean instead of just taking it home with them?"). Do you think it was a good idea to do this?

9. What was the Declaration of Independence?

10. What was in the Declaration of Independence--what did it say?

11. The colonists wanted to break away from England because they thought that the king was treating them unfairly. What do you think the English King George thought about the colonists?

12. Did all of the colonists want to break away from England, or just some of them, or what? (If student says just some of them, ask: "Well, if people disagreed about what to do, then what happened?")

13. Eventually, the Revolutionary War started and fighting broke out between English soldiers and American patriots. Do you know what happened and why?

14. Who were some of the leaders of the American Revolution? (Probe for specifics on at least two)

15. Who were some of the women who participated in the Revolution? (Again, probe for specifics on at least two)

16. What happened after the war was over?

17. After the Revolutionary War, the 13 colonies had become the United States. The land and the people were still the same, so what had changed? How were the 13 United States different from the 13 colonies? (Probe) Conditional follow ups (IF student does not answer #17 fully):

    17a. Who was the person (or persons) in charge of the colonies before the revolution? (If student says the governor, ask who was in charge of the governor).

    17b. After the revolution the colonies became the United States. Who was the person(s) in charge of them then? How did this person(s) get to be in charge?

18. How did the people form a government for their new country called the United States? What did they do?

19. Have you ever heard of the Articles of Confederation? If so, tell me what you know about them. (Probe extensively)

20. What is the Constitution of the United States? Tell what you know about it. (Probe extensively: Who wrote it, Why was it written, What is in it, etc.)

21. If there was an argument at lunch recess between some of the kids in this class and some other fifth-graders about who was going to use the soccer field, how do you think it should be handled? (Probe, ask for the "why" and where they learned about it)

22. What happens if you have a different idea about what happened in American history than other kids in class? (Probe)

23. What happens if your idea about American history is different than Ms. Teacher's? What happens then? (Probe)

24. If you got involved in making this neighborhood or community a better place than it is now, what would you do? (Probe)

25. If you got involved in making this country a better place than it is now, what would you do? (Probe, then ask: Which would you rather get involved in improving, the country or the community or both? Why?)

26. When you do assignments for class and to hand in to your teacher, which do you prefer--to work alone, with a partner, or in groups? (Probe)

27. How do you think important decisions should be made here in this class? (Probe) How about at home? (Probe)

28. Did you think learning about the American Revolution and the Constitution was interesting, or not, or what? Tell me what you thought about studying this history. (Probe)

29. What do you think about this interview? Why do you think I'm asking you all these questions?

Appendix E

TABLE 1. K-W-L DATA BY CLASS

QUESTION 1: What do I know about the American Revolution?

	Atkinson's Class			Palmer's Class		
	Males (n=13)	Females (n=9)	TOTAL (N=22)	Males (n=10)	Females (n=10)	TOTAL (N=20)
Nothing; not very much	2	4	6	-	1	1
A. Names, Events, and Terms						
1. Names						
George Washington (general)	4	1	5	3	2	5
Paul Revere	-	-	0	5	6	11
Thomas Jefferson	2	-	2	-	-	0
John Adams	1	-	1	1	-	1
Molly Pitcher	-	-	0	1	-	1
Deborah Sampson	-	1	1	-	-	0
Abigail Adams (had a role)	-	1	1	-	-	0
2. Events						
Boston Tea Party	2	-	2	4	-	4
Paul Revere's Ride	-	-	0	1	1	2
Battle of Lexington	-	-	0	1	1	2
Minutemen (ready in a minute)	-	-	0	1	1	2
Battle of Bunker Hill	-	-	0	-	2	2
3. Terms						
Declaration of Independence	2	-	2	-	1	1
Indians	-	-	0	1	1	2
Mayflower	-	-	0	1	-	1
Jamestown	-	-	0	1	-	1
B. Cause-Effect Relationships						
England fought for freedom	2	-	2	-	-	0
A war for freedom; independence	1	-	1	1	-	1
A war started by America	1	1	2	1	1	2
Had to do with taxes (on tea)	-	1	1	1	1	2
England fought to control us	-	-	0	1	-	1
Americans won the war	-	-	0	3	2	5
Fought over slavery; North won	-	-	0	1	-	1
Trade was a reason for the war	-	-	0	-	1	1
C. General Ideas						
It was a revolution; a war	5	2	7	-	2	2
Around 1700s; a long time ago	4	-	4	2	-	2
Many people died	-	-	0	2	4	6
Lasted for five years	-	-	0	-	2	2
Rebels were mistreated by British	-	-	0	1	-	1
Fought between French and Americans	-	-	0	1	-	1
Brits hired the Hessians	-	-	0	-	1	1
Women helped the soldiers	-	1	1	-	-	0
Tories supported England	-	-	0	1	1	2
Rebels supported the revolution	-	-	0	1	1	2
Cannons, muskets, pistols	-	-	0	2	-	2
The redcoats were coming	-	-	0	1	1	2
"Give me liberty or give me death"	-	-	0	1	-	1
Famous war with famous people	-	-	0	2	-	2
No modern weapons	-	-	0	1	-	1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 2. K-W-L DATA BY CLASS

QUESTION 2: What do I want to know about the American Revolution?

	Atkinson's Class			Palmer's Class		
	Males (n=13)	Females (n=9)	TOTAL (N=22)	Males (n=10)	Females (n=10)	TOTAL (N=20)
Everything; anything	7	5	12	2	1	3
I don't know	-	1	1	-	-	0
How and why they fought?	1	-	1	3	9	12
What women were involved?	-	4	4	1	-	1
Who fought against America?	1	-	1	-	6	6
How many survived? (or died?)	-	1	1	5	4	9
When it happened? (or started?)	-	-	0	5	9	14
How long did it last?	-	-	0	3	4	7
Where did it take place?	-	-	0	3	6	9
Who was in it?	-	-	0	2	3	5
More about quotations?	-	-	0	1	5	6
What were the events?	-	-	0	1	2	3
How did it get started?	1	1	2	2	1	3
More about battles?	1	-	1	2	1	3
More about war leaders?	1	-	1	2	2	4
Famous people?	-	1	1	1	3	4
What sort of weapons?	-	-	0	1	2	3
How did it end?	-	-	0	-	3	3
Who made the flag?	-	-	0	2	-	2
How long ago did it happen?	-	-	0	1	1	2
More about the Boston Tea Party?	1	-	1	-	-	0
More about George Washington?	1	-	1	-	-	0
More about places in the war?	-	1	1	-	1	1
Did women sneak into the war?	-	1	1	-	-	0
More about Deborah Sampson?	-	1	1	-	-	0
Did they sign a treaty?	-	-	0	1	-	1
Who was president?	-	-	0	1	-	1
Were Native Americans in it?	-	-	0	1	-	1
Whose fault was it?	-	-	0	-	1	1
Could they have stopped the war?	-	-	0	-	1	1
Did people want to fight in the war?	-	-	0	-	1	1
What happened because of the war?	-	-	0	-	1	1
Who attacked first?	-	-	0	-	1	1
Why did they fight over a tea party?	-	-	0	1	-	1
Is the woman who made the flag in this story?	-	-	0	-	1	1
What affect does it have on us today?	-	-	0	-	1	1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 3. K-W-L DATA BY CLASS

QUESTION 3: What have I learned about the American Revolution?

	Atkinson's Class			Palmer's Class		
	Males (n=12)	Females (n=10)	TOTAL (N=22)	Males (n=12)	Females ((n=13)	TOTAL (N=25)
A. Recall of Names, Events, Terms						
1. Names						
George Washington (general, leader)	-	1	1	4	7	11
Thomas Jefferson	-	-	0	1	9	10
Paul Revere (famous ride; had helpers)	-	-	0	6	6	12
Ben Franklin	-	-	0	5	7	12
Molly Pitcher (helped colonial soldiers)	-	-	0	8	10	18
Sam Adams	1	-	1	5	3	8
John Hancock	-	-	0	1	5	6
Nathan Hale (famous quote)	-	-	0	3	1	4
King George	-	-	0	1	3	4
James Madison	-	-	0	2	1	3
John Adams	-	-	0	2	-	2
Patrick Henry	-	-	0	2	-	2
Benedict Arnold	-	-	0	2	-	2
General Howe	-	-	0	1	1	2
John Paul Jones	-	1	1	1	-	1
Alexander Hamilton	-	1	1	-	-	0
Lydia Darragh	-	-	0	-	1	1
General Cornwallis	-	-	0	-	1	1
Deborah Sampson	-	-	0	-	1	1
Thomas Paine	-	-	0	-	1	1
Thomas Edison (getting peace in Britain)	-	-	0	1	-	1
2. Events (with descriptions)						
Boston Tea Party	5	3	8	10	8	18
Boston Massacre	1	-	1	9	2	11
Battle at Lexington (first shots)	1	1	2	1	2	3
Battle at Concord (second battle)	-	-	0	1	2	3
Battle at Saratoga (turning point)	1	-	1	1	1	2
Boycotting (following tea tax)	1	-	1	-	-	0
Ratification of the Constitution (struggle over)	3	5	8	-	-	0
Passage of the Bill of Rights	1	1	2	1	4	5
Signing of the Declaration of Independence	-	1	1	5	6	11
French and Indian War	-	-	0	4	1	5
Paul Revere's ride	-	-	0	4	5	9
Suprise attack on British/Hessians at Trenton	-	-	0	3	2	5
Treaty of Paris signed	-	-	0	2	-	2
King George's passing of unfair taxes	-	-	0	-	3	3
French joined Americans	-	-	0	-	1	1
Winter at Valley Forge	-	-	0	-	1	1
States sent representatives to the Continental Congress	-	-	0	-	1	1
3. Terms (listed)						
Three Branches of Government	5	5	10	-	-	0
Continental Congress	-	-	0	6	4	10
Hessians	-	-	0	7	2	9
Intolerable Acts	2	-	2	4	4	8
Declaration of Independence	1	1	2	4	3	7
Minutemen	-	-	0	4	3	7
Bill of Rights (Amendments)	-	-	0	2	4	6
The Constitution	2	3	5	-	-	0
Articles of Confederation	-	-	0	4	1	5
Patriots and Loyalists	-	-	0	1	4	5
Militia	-	-	0	1	2	3
Sons of Liberty	1	-	1	1	1	2
Daughters of Liberty	-	-	0	1	1	2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 3. (continued)

3. Terms (continued)	Atkinson's Class Males (n=12)	Females (n=10)	TOTAL (N=22)	Palmer's Class Males (n=12)	Females (n=13)	TOTAL (N=25)
Tax Acts (e.g., Stamp Act)	2	1	3	1	-	1
"No taxation without representation"	-	-	0	1	1	2
Traitor	-	1	1	1	-	1
Privateers	-	-	0	2	-	2
The American Revolution	-	-	0	1	1	2
"Give me liberty or give me death"	-	-	0	-	1	1
"Shot heard 'round the world"	-	-	0	1	-	1
B. Cause-Effect Relationships						
Colonists fought for freedom from Britain	1	2	3	-	4	4
War fought over "unfair" taxation	1	-	1	-	2	2
Constitution needed ratication for passage	4	2	6	-	-	0
Bill of Rights protects people's freedom	1	-	1	-	-	0
Women helped to win the war	2	2	4	-	3	3
Many died because of the war	-	-	0	1	-	1
America became the U.S. because they won the war	-	-	0	-	1	1
C. General Ideas and Statements						
Women had an important role in the war	3	6	9	1	5	6
Learned a lot about famous people; heroes	1	1	2	1	-	1
Learned a lot about laws	1	1	2	-	-	0
Who fought, where, and why	2	-	2	-	3	3
Main strategies of the war	1	-	1	-	-	0
Who won the war	1	-	1	-	-	0
How long the first president served	-	1	1	-	-	0
About foreign help in the war	-	1	1	-	-	0
How people felt about the Constitution	-	1	1	-	-	0
Men in the war	-	2	2	-	-	0
Lifestyle of the colonists	-	1	1	-	-	0
Most men and women were wealthy	-	1	1	-	-	0
Favorite part was the leaders and female spies	-	-	0	1	-	1
Blacks had a role in the war	-	1	1	1	1	2
Britain had the best navy	-	-	0	3	-	3
Many died in many places	-	-	0	1	1	2
Learned famous dates and quotations	-	-	0	1	-	1
The British almost won	-	-	0	1	-	1
King George was very selfish and mean	-	-	0	-	1	1
Everybody was bald	-	-	0	1	-	1
America had no navy	-	-	0	1	-	1
Colonists loved tea	-	-	0	1	-	1
Lasted for a long time	-	-	0	-	1	1
I'd like to be brave like Molly Pitcher someday	-	-	0	-	1	1
It was very interesting	1	-	1	-	-	0
It was fun to learn about	-	1	1	2	1	3
I liked writing the letters to England	-	-	0	1	-	1
People are really racist	-	-	0	-	1	1
Chapters in the textbook were confusing	1	-	1	-	-	0
Textbook should be more comprehensive	-	-	0	1	-	1
Our teacher did a good job teaching us	-	-	0	-	1	1
I learned everything I wanted to know	3	2	5	-	1	1

TABLE 4. STUDENT INTERVIEW DATA BY CLASS

	Atkinson's Class							Palmer's Class						
Students	James	Elena	Jerome	Aimee	Robert	Janine	T	Barry	Abigail	Adam	Lorrie	Frederic	Lara	T
Achievement Level	H	H	H	H	L	L		H	H	H	H	L	L	
Pre Question #1: The colonists became an independent country. How?														
Not sure; don't know	1	-	1	1	-	1	4	1	1	1	1	-	1	5
Wanted freedom	1	1	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	1	-	2
Had a war with the British	-	1	-	1	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
Wrote the Declaration of Independence	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Civil War	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
The Revolutionary War	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
Pilgrims' story (for religious freedom)	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	2
Post Question #4: The colonists became an independent country. How?														
Fought a war over taxes and became free of British control	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	1	1	1	1	1	1	6
After the war, they wrote the Constitution	-	1	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
High taxes were caused by the French and Indian War	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Many events led up to the war	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	1	1	-	1	-	1	4
Colonists wanted independence so the king taxed them	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	1	-	-	-	1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	Atkinson's Class							Palmer's Class						
Students	James	Elena	Jerome	Aimee	Robert	Janine	T	Barry	Abigail	Adam	Lorrie	Frederic	Lara	T
Achievement Level	H	H	M	M	L	L		H	H	M	M	L	L	
Pre Question #2: Why did the colonists change their minds about being ruled by the English King?														
Not sure; don't know	1	1	-	-	1	1	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	6
Colonists had no choices, bossed around	1	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Taxes on tea	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
For freedom of religion	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
They wanted a country of their own	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
Post Question #5: Why did the colonists change their minds?														
Don't know; not sure	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	1
Too many taxes	1	1	1	1	1	-	5	1	1	-	1	1	1	5
Wanted freedom	-	1	1	-	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
Intolerable Acts	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
Pre Question #3: Problems caused by the French and Indian War?														
Not sure; don't know	-	1	1	1	1	1	5	1	1	1	1	1	1	6
French were driven into Canada	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Many died	1	-	-	-	-	1	2	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
Post Question #3: Problems caused by the French and Indian War?														
Not sure; don't know	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	2
Britain was in debt	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	Atkinson's Class							Palmer's Class						
Students	James	Elena	Jerome	Aimee	Robert	Janine	T	Barry	Abigail	Adam	Lorrie	Frederic	Lara	T
Achievement Level	H	H	H	H	L	L		H	H	M	M	L	L	
Britain lost the colonies	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Cost Britain a lot of money	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
No one bought goods from Britain	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
Many people died	-	-	-	1	-	1	2	-	-	1	-	1	-	2
Britain made colonists pay for the war	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
Pre Question #4: What does "No taxation without representation" mean?														
Not sure; don't know	1	1	-	-	1	1	4	1	1	1	1	1	-	5
People shouldn't pay taxes unless they had a say in them in British Parliament	1	1	1	1	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Can't raise taxes without telling why	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
French took the land	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	1	-	-	-	1
If you don't know the person, you can't be there	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Post Question #7: What does "no taxation without representation" mean?														
Colonists wouldn't pay taxes unless they had a say in the British Parliament	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	1	1	1	1	1	1	6
Colonists wanted someone representing them to make decisions	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	Atkinson's Class							Palmer's Class						
Students	James	Elena	Jerome	Aimee	Robert	Janine	T	Barry	Abigail	Adam	Lorrie	Frederic	Lara	T
Achievement Level	H	H	H	H	L	L		H	H	H	H	L	L	
Pre Question #5: What was the Boston Tea Party?														
Not sure; don't know	1	-	-	-	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	-	5
Colonists dressed as Indians, dumped tea in Boston Harbor as a protest against the British	-	1	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
ng had a party to open Boston Harbor	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Threw tea in the water to turn it red	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
Queen had a party	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
Post Question #8: What was the Boston Tea Party?														
Colonists (Sons of Liberty) dressed up as Indians dumped tea in the Boston Harbor as a protest against British taxes	1	1	1	1*	1	1	6	1	1	1	1	1	1	6
(*confused about actors)														
Post Question 8a: Do you think this was a good idea?														
Not a good idea (wrecked the tea and the water)	-	-	-	1	-	1	2	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
Good and bad	1	1	1	-	1	-	4	1	1	-	-	-	-	2
Good because it brought independence; bad because of the Intolerable Acts and the war	1	1	1	-	1	-	4	-	1	-	-	-	-	1

	Atkinson's Class							Palmer's Class						
Students	James	Elena	Jerome	Aimee	Robert	Janine	T	Barry	Abigail	Adam	Lorrie	Frederic	Lara	T
Achievement Level	H	H	M	M	L	L		H	H	M	M	L	L	
It made the king angry but they got their way	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
I don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	1	-	-	-	1
Good idea; it showed the British we meant business	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	1	1	-	2
Pre Question #6: What was the Declaration of Independence?														
Not sure; don't know	-	-	1	-	-	1	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
Document that made U.S. separate from England	1	1	1	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Colonists could choose their own laws	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
Let's people have rights, equality	-	-	-	1	1	1	3	-	1	-	1	-	-	2
Made everyone free; no slaves	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
Lincoln signed papers making people free	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	1	-	-	-	1
Post Question #9: What was the Declaration of Independence?														
A document that declared colonists' independent from England	1	1	-	1	-	1	4	1	1	1	-	1	1	5
It meant freedom (from the British)	-	-	1	-	1	1	3	1	-	-	-	1	1	3
It said everyone could have a place	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	1	-	-	-	1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	Atkinson's Class							Palmer's Class						
Students	James	Elena	Jerome	Aimee	Robert	Janine	T	Barry	Abigail	Adam	Lorrie	Frederic	Lara	T
Achievement Level	H	H	H	H	L	L		H	H	H	H	L	L	
Pre Question #7: What was in the Declaration of Independence?														
Not sure; don't know	1	1	1	-	1	1	5	1	1	1	1	1	-	5
Right to vote and be treated equal	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
People should be fair to everyone	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Post Question #10: What was in the Declaration of Independence?														
Explained the wrongs of King George and justified separation	1	-	-	-	1	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Said the British could not tax the colonies	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Talks about how people should be treated	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
A heading, preamble, declaration	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	1	-	-	1	-	-	2
Says why we should have independence	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	1	-	-	1	-	2
Separates us from Britain	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	1	-	-	-	1
Not sure; don't remember	-	-	1	-	-	1	2	1	-	-	1	-	1	3
Pre Question #8: What did King George think about the colonists?														
Not sure; don't know	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
If he gave them support, they would follow him	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Pilgrims separated for religious reasons	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
He thought he was helping the colonists	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0

	Atkinson's Class							Palmer's Class						
Students	James	Elena	Jerome	Aimee	Robert	Janine	T	Barry	Abigail	Adam	Lorrie	Frederic	Lara	T
Achievement Level	H	H	M	M	L	L		H	H	M	M	L	L	
He became angry when colonists rebelled	-	1	1	1	-	-	3	-	1	1	-	1	1	4
He had a right to be angry	-	1	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
He raised taxes so he had no right to be angry	-	-	1	1	-	-	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
Thought the colonists were bad citizens	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
Colonists weren't very smart	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Colonists were crazy	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
They were good colonists	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
Post Question #11: What did King George think about the colonists?														
He thought the colonists were being unfair	-	-	1	1	1	1	4	-	1	1	1	-	-	3
He was angry and had a right to be	-	1	1	1	-	1	4	1	1	1	-	1	-	4
He thought he was doing the best he could by paying the war debt	1	1	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
He had no right to be upset	-	-	-	1	1	1	3	-	-	-	1	1	1	3
Didn't care what the colonists thought	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Pre Question #9: Did all the colonists want to break away, or what?														
All of them did	-	-	-	-	1	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Only some did	1	1	-	1	-	-	3	1	-	1	1	-	-	3
Not sure	1	-	-	-	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	-	5
May have caused a war	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	Atkinson's Class							Palmer's Class						
Students	James	Elena	Jerome	Aimee	Robert	Janine	T	Barry	Abigail	Adam	Lorrie	Frederic	Lara	T
Achievement Level	H	H	M	M	L	L		H	H	M	M	L	L	
Wouldn't work well together	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Post Question #12: Did all of colonists want to break away, or what?														
Some of them	1	1	1	1	-	-	4	1	1	1	1	1	-	5
First, just a third, then later two-thirds wanted independence	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Some fought each other	1	-	-	1	1	-	3	1	1	-	1	1	-	4
Some tried to convince others to remain loyal	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Patriots wanted to break away; loyalists wanted to stay loyal to England	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	2
Most of them	-	-	-	-	1	1	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
Some loyalists had to go back to England	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
One-third did, one-third didn't, one-third didn't care	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Not sure what happened	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	1	-	1	1	3
Pre Question #10: Eventually fighting broke out--What happened and why?														
Not sure; don't know	-	1	-	-	-	1	2	1	1	-	-	-	1	3
Patriots won	1	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	1	-	2
Colonists wanted to break free	-	-	1	1	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Washington was the general of the patriots	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Many were killed	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	2

	Atkinson's Class							Palmer's Class						
Students	James	Elena	Jerome	Aimee	Robert	Janine	T	Barry	Abigail	Adam	Lorrie	Frederic	Lara	T
Achievement Level	H	H	M	M	L	L		H	H	M	M	L	L	
Patriots and troops fought	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
Paul Revere warned that the British were coming	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	1	-	-	-	1
The Redcoats won	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
Post Question #13: Eventually fighting broke out--What happened and why?														
I'm not sure; don't know	-	1	-	1	-	1	3	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
Battle of Lexington started the war	1	-	1	1	1	-	4	-	-	1	-	1	1	3
British marched looking for ammunition	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Colonists fought for freedom	-	-	-	1	1	-	2	1	-	-	-	1	-	2
Boston Massacre started the war	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
Redcoats tried to stop the colonists from separating	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	1	-	1	-	-	-	2
We don't know who shot first	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	1	1	-	1	1	4
Paul Revere warned the colonists about the Redcoats	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	1	-	1	-	2
Pre Question #11: Who were leaders in the American Revolution?														
Not sure; don't know	-	1	-	1	1	1	4	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
William Penn	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
John Smith	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
John Berkeley	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Ben Franklin	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
Paul Revere	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	1
George Washington	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	1	-	1	1	4
Abraham Lincoln	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	1	-	-	-	-	-	1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	Atkinson's Class							Palmer's Class						
Students	James	Elena	Jerome	Aimee	Robert	Janine	T	Barry	Abigail	Adam	Lorrie	Frederic	Lara	T
Achievement Level	H	H	H	H	L	L		H	H	H	H	L	L	
John Hancock	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
Thomas Jefferson	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
Provides details about at least one person	1	-	1	-	-	1	3	-	1	-	-	1	-	2
Post Question #14: Who were leaders in the American Revolution?														
Not sure, don't know	-	-	-	1	-		1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
John Hancock	1	1	-	-	1	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
John Adams	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Sam Adams	1	1	1	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Thomas Jefferson	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	-	-	1	3
George Washington	1	1	-	-	1	1	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	6
Swamp Fox	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Paul Revere	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	1	-	-	3
Ben Franklin	-	-	1	-	1	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	1	2
Thomas Paine	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Patrick Henry	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
Nathan Hale	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
Gives details about at least one person	1	1	1	-	1	1	5	1	1	1	1	1	1	6
Pre Question #12: Who were some of women of the Revolution?														
Not sure; don't know	1	1	-	1	1	-	4	-	1	1	1	-	-	3
Debbie Reed	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Betsy Ross	-	-	1	-	-	1	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
Molly Pitcher	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	1	-	1	-	1	-	3
George Washington	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	1	1

	Atkinson's Class							Palmer's Class						
Students	James	Elena	Jerome	Aimee	Robert	Janine	T	Barry	Abigail	Adam	Lorrie	Frederic	Lara	T
Achievement Level	H	H	M	M	L	L		H	H	M	M	L	L	
Post Question #15: Who were some of the women of the Revolution?														
Not sure; don't know	-	1	-	-	1	-	2	-	-	-	1	1	-	2
Molly Pitcher	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	1	1	1	5
Woman who dressed as a man to fight	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
Woman who led the boycott of tea	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Abigail Adams	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Betsy Ross	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Phoebe, the Spy	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	1	-	-	-	1
Gives details on at least one person	1	1	1	1	-	1	5	1	1	1	1	1	1	6
Pre Question #13: What happened after the war was over?														
Not sure; don't know	-	-	-	-	1	1	2	-	1	1	-	-	-	2
Colonies became the United States	1	1	1	1	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Chose a president	-	1	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Americans fought and won	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	2
People fought and claimed land	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
Everyone had freedom	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
They made peace	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Post Question #16: What happened after the war was over?														
The colonists won and became the United States	1	1	-	1	-	1	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	6
Wrote the Constitution (states had to ratify it)	1	1	-	-	1	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	Atkinson's Class							Palmer's Class						
Students	James	Elena	Jerome	Aimée	Robert	Janine	T	Barry	Abigail	Adam	Lorrie	Frederic	Lara	T
Achievement Level	H	H	M	M	L	L		H	M	M	M	L	L	
Added the Bill of Rights to get the Constitution ratified	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Needed to create laws to run the country	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	2
Gave power to a central government	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
Started by creating a government that was not strong enough	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Voted to get representatives to run the country	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
Had branches of government	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
Made a peace treaty	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	1	-	-	-	1
Pre Question #14: How were the United States different from the 13 colonies?														
Not sure; don't know	-	1	-	-	-	1	2	1	-	1	-	1	1	4
They made their own decisions	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	2
They had freedom	1	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
They were united as one	1	-	-	-	1	-	2	-	1	-	-	-	1	2
They had democracy	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Divided up into areas like states	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
They had presidents	-	-	-	-	1	1	2	1	1	1	-	-	1	4
Created Congress	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
Colonies looked like parks	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
Post Question #17: How were the United States different from the 13 colonies?														
They created laws to join together as one country--wrote the Constitution to become the United States	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	-	1	-	-	-	-	1

	Atkinson's Class							Palmer's Class						
Students	James	Elena	Jerome	Aimee	Robert	Janine	T	Barry	Abigail	Adam	Lorrie	Frederic	Lara	T
Achievement Level	H	H	M	M	L	L		H	H	M	M	L	L	
Got a president to lead the U.S.	-	-	-	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	6
Got representatives to make laws	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
Made a democracy	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	1	-	1	-	2
Don't know; not sure	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Pre Question #15: How did the people form a new government for the U.S.?														
Don't know; not sure	1	1	1	-	1	1	5	1	-	-	-	1	-	2
They made decisions to have a democracy	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Voting	1	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
They got into arguments about leadership	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
They picked a president and congress	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Had leaders make decisions	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	1	1	1	1	5
Columbus helped them	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
Had meetings	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	1	1	-	1	3
Post Question #18: How did people form a new government for the U.S.?														
Don't know; not sure	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	2
They wrote a Constitution that needed to be ratified by the states	1	1	1	1	1	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
People met to make a government	-	1	1	1	1	-	4	-	1	1	1	1	1	5
Describes ratification process (Bill of Rights)	1	1	1	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	Atkinson's Class							Palmer's Class						
Students	James	Elena	Jerome	Aimee	Robert	Janine	T	Barry	Abigail	Adam	Lorrie	Frederic	Lara	T
Achievement Level	H	H	H	H	L	L		H	H	H	H	L	L	
Went from Articles of Confederation to the Constitution	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Voted to have a president	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	1	-	1	-	-	-	2
Branches of government	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	1	-	-	1	-	2
Pre Question #16: What do you know about the Articles of Confederation?														
Not sure; nothing	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	1	1	1	1	1	1	6
Post Question #19: What do you know about the Articles of Confederation?														
Not sure; don't remember	1	1	-	1	1	1	5	1	1	-	1	-	1	4
A form of government people didn't agree with	1	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	1
Weak form of government that came before the Constitution	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
Pre Question #17: What is the Constitution? Explain.														
Not sure; don't know	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	6
It's about freedom and rights, laws	1	-	1	-	1	-	3	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
The things to get a democracy started	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
A set of rules for how to treat people	-	1	-	-	1	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	0

	Atkinson's Class							Palmer's Class						
Students	James	Elena	Jerome	Aimee	Robert	Janine	T	Barry	Abigail	Adam	Lorrie	Frederic	Lara	T
Achievement Level	H	H	H	H	L	L		H	H	H	H	L	L	
Written to govern the country	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Rules for dividing the country into parts	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Group of people that helps with laws	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
Post Question #20: What is the Constitution? Explain														
Not sure; don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	1	1	1	-	1	4
How the government works; explains laws	1	-	-	1	-	1	3	1	-	-	-	1	-	2
Explains the powers of government in the U.S.	-	1	-	-	1	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
It guarantees people's rights	-	-	1	1	1	-	3	1	1	1	-	1	-	4
An enlarged Declaration of Independence	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
It's about Amendments	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	1	1	-	1	3
Pre Question #18: How do you think an argument on the playground over the use of a tennis court should be handled?														
Share the space	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	1	1	-	4
Put ideas together and make a game for everyone	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Switch it off by recesses/week	1	1	1	-	1	-	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	6
Talk out a solution	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	1	1	1	-	1	1	5
Majority rule	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Reach consensus	-	1	-	-	-	1	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
Have an adult decide	-	-	1	1	1	1	4	1	1	1	-	-	-	3

66

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	Atkinson's Class							Palmer's Class						
Students	James	Elena	Jerome	Aimee	Robert	Janine	T	Barry	Abigail	Adam	Lorrie	Frederic	Lara	T
Achievement Level	H	H	H	H	L	L		H	H	H	H	L	L	
Have student representatives argue why they needed the tennis court	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Whoever gets there first	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
Get into a fight; just kidding	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Post Question #21: How do you think an argument over the use of the soccer field should be handled?														
Fairly, equal treatment	1	1	1	-	-	1	4	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
Switch off recesses	1	1	1	-	1	1	5	1	1	1	-	1	-	4
Ask a teacher to arbitrate	1	-	1	-	-	1	3	-	-	1	1	-	1	3
No fighting	-	1	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	1	1	3
Split the field in half	-	-	-	1	1	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	1
Talk out a solution	1	-	1	1	-	1	4	-	1	1	1	-	1	4
Share the space	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	1	1	1	1	-	1	5
Pre Question #19: What happens if you have a different idea about what happened in U.S. history than the other kids in class?														
That's OK	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	1	1	-	1	1	1	5
People have a right to their opinion	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	-	-	1	-	-	-	1
We have debates of pros and cons in class	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
We disagree with each other a lot in class	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Refer to book to prove your answer	-	-	1	-	-	1	2	1	1	-	-	-	1	3

	Atkinson's Class							Palmer's Class						
Students	James	Elena	Jerome	Aimee	Robert	Janine	T	Barry	Abigail	Adam	Lorrie	Frederic	Lara	T
Achievement Level	H	H	M	M	L	L		H	H	M	M	L	L	
Agree to disagree	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
Sometimes there's only opinions to things	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	1	-	-	-	1	2
Teacher keeps arguments under control	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
Post Question #22: What happens if you have a different idea about what happened in U.S. history than the other kids in class?														
That's OK	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	1	1	1	1	1	1	6
Check books to prove what's right and wrong	1	-	1	1	-	1	4	1	-	-	1	1	1	4
Opinion depends on point of view	1	1	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Reach consensus	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
History is mostly facts, but some opinions	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
Have a teacher or historian give the answer	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
The most evidence would solve the problem	-	-	1	-	-	1	2	-	1	-	-	1	-	2
History is a lot of opinions	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Talk out opinions	-	-	-	1	1	-	2	-	1	-	1	1	-	3
Choose the side that's fair	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
Pre Question #20: What happens if your idea about U.S. history is different from your teacher's idea?														
That's OK	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	1	1	-	1	1	1	5
Everyone has a right to their own opinion	1	-	1	-	1	-	3	-	-	1	-	1	-	2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	Atkinson's Class							Palmer's Class						
Students	James	Elena	Jerome	Aimee	Robert	Janine	T	Barry	Abigail	Adam	Lorrie	Frederic	Lara	T
Achievement Level	H	H	M	M	L	L		H	H	M	M	L	L	
Bill of Rights gives you freedom of speech	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Opinion depends on where you're from or your family background	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Need good reasons for your opinions	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Need to back up your opinion with information from books	-	-	1	1	-	1	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
When you disagree, talk it over	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
She usually wins	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
It hasn't happened to me	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
You have to be respectful	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
Post Question #23: What happens if your idea about U.S. history is different from your teacher's idea?														
That's OK	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	1	1	1	1	1	1	6
If it's an opinion, that's OK; if it's a fact, then someone's wrong	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
If it comes up on a test, then she's right	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
She encourages us to have our own opinion	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Check a book to settle the question; don't make a big argument of it	-	-	1	-	-	1	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
Speak your own opinion	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	1	-	3
Talk out a solution	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Teachers aren't supposed to tell kids what to believe	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	1	-	-	-	-	1

	Atkinson's Class							Palmer's Class						
Students	James	Elena	Jerome	Aimee	Robert	Janine	T	Barry	Abigail	Adam	Lorrie	Frederic	Lara	T
Achievement Level	H	H	M	M	L	L		H	H	M	M	L	L	
Pre Question #21: What would you do to improve your community or neighborhood?														
Not sure; don't know	-	1	1	-	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
Make schools better	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Clean up pollution	1	-	-	-	-	1	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	1
Find jobs for the homeless	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Recycle	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Voting for kids	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Gun laws; end violence	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
It's good as it is	-	-	1	-	1	1	3	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
Fix up houses	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Make things closer together	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
Ice-skating rink	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
Local picnics	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
Plant trees	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
Post Question #24: What would you do to improve your community?														
Not sure; don't know	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Clean up pollution	1	-	1	1	-	1	4	-	1	1	1	1	-	4
Better schools	1	-	1	-	-	-	2	1	-	1	-	-	-	2
Get rid of gangs, violence	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
It's good as it is	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Better protection	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	2
No littering	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Put bad people in jail	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
Recycle	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	1	-	1	2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	Atkinson's Class							Palmer's Class						
Students	James	Elena	Jerome	Aimee	Robert	Janine	T	Barry	Abigail	Adam	Lorrie	Frederic	Lara	T
Achievement Level	M	M	M	M	L	L		M	M	M	M	L	L	
Pre Question #22: What would you do to make this country a better place to live?														
Not sure; don't know	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
Spend less on defense; more on schools, the homeless, pollution	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Support peace	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	1	3
I wouldn't get involved in improving the country; too risky	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	2
Laws about pollution	-	-	-	1	1	-	2	1	-	1	1	-	1	4
Give students opportunity to vote (like in our class)	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Feed people	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
No drinking; drugs	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
Plant trees	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
Live like the Indians	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Post Question #25: What would you do to improve this country? Which would you prefer: to improve the country or the local community?														
Improve the country--bigger benefits	1	-	-	-	1	1	3	-	1	1	1	1	-	4
Improve the community--it's easier	-	1	1	1	-	-	3	1	1	-	1	-	1	4
World peace	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
Eliminate racism and sexism	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Change laws	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Clean things up (e.g., pollution, crime)	-	-	-	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	-	1	1	5
Plant trees; recycle	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	1	-	-	1

	Atkinson's Class							Palmer's Class						
Students	James	Elena	Jerome	Aimee	Robert	Janine	T	Barry	Abigail	Adam	Lorrie	Frederic	Lara	T
Achievement Level	H	H	M	M	L	L		M	H	M	M	L	L	
Pre Question #25: When doing assignments, do you prefer to work in groups, pairs, or alone? Why?														
Groups (It's more fun; you learn more, new ideas)	1	-	1	1	-	1	4	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
Pairs (easier to concentrate)	-	1	-	1	1	1	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	6
Alone (concentrate better, easier)	-	-	1	1	-	-	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
Depends on the assignment or your partner	-	-	1	1	-	-	2	1	1	-	-	-	-	2
Too much arguing in a group	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	1	-	1	-	-	1	3
Post Question #26: When doing assignments, do you prefer to work in groups, pairs, or alone? Why?														
Groups (better ideas, learn more, it's fun, you can collaborate if it's quiet)	1	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	1	-	2
Pairs (easier, more ideas, group is too hard when people disagree, too confusing)	-	1	1	1	1	1	5	1	-	1	-	-	1	3
Alone (sometimes it's faster, too much shouting in a big group)	-	-	1	1	-	-	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
Depends on subject and assignment	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	Atkinson's Class							Palmer's Class						
Students	James	Elena	Jerome	Aimee	Robert	Janine	T	Barry	Abigail	Adam	Lorrie	Frederic	Lara	T
Achievement Level	H	H	M	M	L	L		H	H	M	M	L	L	
Pre Question #24: How do you think important decisions should be made in this class?														
Vote on them	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	1	1	-	-	1	-	3
Vote on things that involve everybody in class	1	-	-	-	-	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Talk about decision before voting	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	2
Not fair for the teacher to have all the say, or students	-	-	1	1	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
By democracy	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Some decisions should be made by those in charge	-	-	1	1	-	1	3	1	-	-	1	-	1	3
Majority rule	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	1
No key issue has comes up	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	1	-	-	-	1	-	2
Post Question #27: How do you think important decisions should be made in this class?														
Vote on them, by democracy	1	-	1	1	1	1	5	1	1	-	-	1	-	3
Majority rule	1	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
Talk about decisions	-	1	1	-	-	-	2	-	1	1	-	1	1	4
Teacher can choose but should listen to kids	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	1	1	4
Teacher could choose what to teach us	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	6
Students should not make decisions about what they learn	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	1	1	-	2

	Atkinson's Class							Palmer's Class						
Students	James	Elena	Jerome	Aimee	Robert	Janine	T	Barry	Abigail	Adam	Lorrie	Frederic	Lara	T
Achievement Level	H	H	M	M	L	L		H	H	M	M	L	L	
Post Question #28: Did you find this period in history interesting? Tell me what you thought.														
Interesting	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	1	-	1	-	1	1	4
Not very interesting	-	-	1	1	-	-	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
Not my favorite subject	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Sequence that led to the war	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Struggle over the Constitution	1	-	1	1	1	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
The war itself	-	-	1	-	1	-	2	-	-	1	-	1	-	2
Boston Tea Party	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	2
Three branches	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Sometimes it was hard to follow	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Story of Paul Revere	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
The Amendments	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	1	1	-	-	-	-	2
Taxes simulation	-	-		-	-	-	0	-	1	-	-	-	1	2
Post Question #1: What do you think history is?														
What happened in the past	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	1	1	1	1	1	1	6
Learning from our mistakes	1	-	-	-	1	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Most important things in the past	1	-	-	1	1	1	4	1	-	-	1	-	-	2
Story about what already happened	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Famous people and wars	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Things that changed the world	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	1	-	-	-	1	-	2
Dates we write down	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	1	1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	Atkinson's Class							Palmer's Class						
Students	James	Elena	Jerome	Aimee	Robert	Janine	T	Barry	Abigail	Adam	Lorrie	Frederic	Lara	T
Achievement Level	H	H	M	M	L	L		H	H	M	M	L	L	
Post Question #2: Why do you think they teach you history in school?														
To know about how the country came to be	1	-	1	-	1	1	4	1	-	1	-	1	-	3
It can help you get a job	1	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
Helps you understand others and the present	1	1	1	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
So you know what happened in the past and why	-	1	1	1	1	1	5	1	1	1	-	1	-	4
Helps you correct the problems from the past	-	1	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
May want to be an historian	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
Where else would you learn it	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
I'm not sure	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	1	1	1	-	3
Post Question #3: How might learning history help you in your life away from school?														
It helps you know what things you're interested in	1	-	-	-	-	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Helps you in school (homework, tests)	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	2
Helps you in life in general	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	2
Might help you in a job	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
You could quiz your friends; parents	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
Helps you avoid the mistakes of the past	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0

112

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	Atkinson's Class							Palmer's Class						
Students	James	Elena	Jerome	Aimee	Robert	Janine	T	Barry	Abigail	Adam	Lorrie	Frederic	Lara	T
Achievement Level	H	H	M	M	L	L		H	H	M	M	L	L	
Help your own kids	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Tell your parents what you learned in school	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	1	-	-	-	1
I'm not sure	-	-	1	-	-	1	2	1	-	1	-	1	1	4

TABLE 5. SILVER BURDETT AND GINN TEST RESULTS BY CLASS

35 Multiple Choice Items	Atkinson's Class (N=23)	Palmer's Class (N=25)
Mean Raw Score (Percentage Correct)	27.4 (78%)	27.6 (79%)
High Score (Percentage Correct)	34 (97%) (n=2)	34 (97%) (n=3)
Low Score (Percentage Correct)	17 (49%) (n=1)	13 (37%) (n=1)
Median Score (Percentage Correct)	28.5 (81%)	28.5 (81%)
t=.11 df=46 p>.10		
Test Scores (including essays)*		
Mean Raw Score	32 (78%)	-- --
High Score (41 points possible plus extra credit points)	42 (102%)	-- --
Low Score	19 (45%)	-- --

* Palmer did not use a number scale to grade the essays. As such, a numerical comparison of the overall test scores is not possible here.